DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 648 PS 004 762

TITLE The Children Are Waiting. The Report of the Early Childhood Development Task Force.

INSTITUTION Early Childhood Development Task Force, New York, N.Y.

PUB DATE 20 Jun 70

NOTE 150p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58

DESCRIPTORS *Childhood Needs; *City Wide Programs; Day Care Programs; *Early Childhood; Financial Support; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Physical Facilities; *Preschool Programs; Professional Personnel; *Special Services

IDENTIFIERS New York City; Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

The Task Force on Early Childhood Development for New York City examined early childhood services and explored the feasibility of establishing an office for early childhood services. This report assesses the effectiveness of early childhood services in meeting the needs of children and their parents and recommends changes in the quantity and quality of programs. Section titles are: A Look at Programs, Parent and Community Involvement, Staffing Qualifications, Expansion of Facilities, Department of Early Childhood Services. Three appendixes present (A) Fact Sheets on Early Childhood Programs, (B) Excerpts from New York City Health Code on Staffing Qualifications, (C) Steps for Establishing a Department of Social Services Group Day Care Center. (WY)

EDO 55648

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE CHILDREN ARE WAITING

THE REPORT

OF THE

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

TASK FORCE

PS 004762

JULY 20, 1970

ARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE

c/o HUMAN RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION
220 CHURCH STREET, ROOM 607
NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK 10013
(212) 433-4850

ED 228

July 20, 1970

Mr. Jule M. Sugarman
Administrator
Human Resources Administration
220 Church Street
New York, New York 10013

Dear Mr. Sugarman:

We are happy to present to you officially the report and recommendations of the Early Childhood Development Task Force appointed at the request of the Mayor by former Human Resources Administrator Mitchell I. Ginsberg.

I know you are familiar with the charges given to the Task Force and have kept in close touch with our work. It seems important to stress the fact that the Task Force members who represented many different points of view were able to reach a concensus.

Members of the Task Force were tireless and totally committed to the task at hand. Their work, however, would not have been possible without the wholehearted support of Mitchell I. Ginsberg, who was always available and assigned to the Task Force a full-time staff under the brillant and wise leadership of Miss Georgia L. McMurray. She was devotedly and ably supported by Dolores Kazanjian, Marie Sloan, William H. Brett and staff from Project Management and Corporation Counsel. Miss Jan Tyroler was of great help in writing the report.

We are fortunate, not only to have the Mayor's full support but to be able to depend on you for the actual implementation of our recommendations. We know of your deep commitment to the fullest development of early childhood programs and we wish to assure you of our full support and help in every way.

Sincerely,

Trude Lash

Trude Lash
Chairman

TL:ems

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Early Childhood Development Task Force . . .	iii
	Statement of Belief.	1
I.	Introduction	4
II.	Department of Early Childhood Services . . .	15
III.	A Look at the Programs	31
IV.	Parent and Community Involvement	48
V.	Staffing Qualifications	58
VI.	Expansion of Facilities	72

Appendix A

Fact Sheets on Early Childhood Programs

Appendix B

Excerpts from the New York City Health Code on Staffing Qualifications

Appendix C

Steps for Establishing a DOSS Group Day Care Center

THE EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE

Chairman

Mrs. Trude Lash
Executive Director
Citizens Committee for Children

Members

David J. Billings, III
Chairman
New York City Council Against Poverty

Mrs. Katherine E. Brooks
Director
Opportunities Unequalled and Remedial Services (OURS)

Mrs. Mary Codner
Chairman
City-Wide Policy Advisory Board of Family Day Care

Gordon Davis
Assistant to the Mayor

Miss Lee Dlugin
Staff Representative
Local 1707
Community and Social Agency Employees Union

Mrs. Cynthia Farris
Chairman
City-Wide Head Start Committee

Mrs. Carol Fernandez
Director
Family Day Care Program
East Harlem Tenants Council

John O. Forrer
Assistant Budget Director
Bureau of the Budget

Mrs. Genevieve Gaines
Chief
Division of Day Care,
Day Camps and Institutions
Department of Health

Frederick D. Goldberg
President
Professional Association, Day Care Directors of New York

Mrs. Elinor Guggenheimer
Honorary Chairman
Day Care Council of New York, Inc.

Mrs. Sylvia Hunter
Acting Assistant Deputy Administrator
Program Planning and Development
Human Resources Administration

Miss Muriel Katz
Director
Division of Day Care
Department of Social Services

Mrs. Dorothy Pitman
Chairman
Committee for Community Controlled Day Care

Peter H. Sauer
Director
Day Care Consultation Services
Bank Street College of Education

Alvin Simon
Consultant
M.F.Y. Group Child Care, Inc.

Mrs. Nancie Stewart
President
Day Care Council of New York, Inc.

Miss Dorothy Stoneman
Executive Director
East Harlem Block Schools

The Honorable Joseph B. Williams
Administrator
Model Cities Administration

Mrs. Rebecca A. Winton
Director
Bureau of Early Childhood
Board of Education

TASK FORCE STAFF

Director

Georgia L. McMurray
Director, Social Services Planning/Special Projects
Human Resources Administration

Program Specialist

Dolores Kazanjian
Social Services Planning/Special Projects
Human Resources Administration

Consultants

From the Mayor's Project Management Office:

William H. Brett

Tony Bonaparte
Suzanne Fox
Joan Hochman
Marshall Shields

From the Department of Social Services:

Robert K. Davis
Executive Assistant,
Special Office of Day Care

From the Corporation Counsel:

Phyllis Roberts

Editor

Miss Jan Tyroler
Assistant Director/Public Affairs
Human Resources Administration

Secretary

Marie Sloan

STATEMENT OF BELIEF

Because we value our children, the members of the Task Force believe

. . . that every child, regardless of his economic, social or family background, has a right to the advantages of an enriched pre-school experience, including a range of health, educational and social services,

. . . that children with special needs must receive full and special consideration in the planning of any early childhood services,

. . . and, that until such time as early childhood programs are available to all children, priority must be given to those in families with the greatest economic and social need.

Because we value family life, the Task Force believes

. . . that to create early childhood services solely as an alternative to public assistance is not desirable,

. . . that no mother should be forced to work as a condition for using early childhood services,

. . . that parents have the right to decide which services best meet the needs of their children,

. . . that early childhood services must be viewed as a support extended to families,

. . . that strong parent involvement must be a prime factor in the development and on-going operation of early childhood centers,

. . . and, that it must be made easier for families to obtain services for their children.

Because the life of our city depends upon the re-emergence of a sense of community, the Task Force believes

. . . that maximum flexibility in the designing of new programs must be encouraged to truly reflect individual community needs,

. . . that community representatives must be involved in the initial planning of facilities and must have the opportunity to originate and sponsor programs,

. . . and that government, at every level, has the responsibility to provide the means by which all this can happen.

"Know you what it is to be a child? .....it is to believe in love, to believe in lovliness, to believe in belief; it is to be so little that the elves can reach to whisper in your ear; it is to turn pumpkins into coaches, and mice into horses, lowness into loftiness; and nothing into everything . . ."

Francis Thompson

INTRODUCTION

On March 9, 1970 Mayor John V. Lindsay appointed a 21-member Task Force to examine early childhood services in New York City, to assess their effectiveness in meeting the needs of children and their parents, and to recommend changes in the quantity and quality of the programs. In his charge, the Mayor requested that the Task Force explore the feasibility of establishing an office for early childhood services.

For a number of years, civic and community groups had expressed concern about the shortage of early childhood services in the City and about the confusion resulting from lack of coordination of, and communication between, existing programs. In 1966, a report, *Ladder to Learning*, prepared by Dr. Milton Young for a group of representatives of civic and governmental agencies, recommended a process of coordination. Subsequently, a number of meetings were called by the Human Resources Administration in order to consider problems in the early childhood field. Continuing concern was expressed by the Mayor in his 1970-71 Budget

Message. He stated that "there are currently eight different pre-school programs operated by the City under the auspices of two separate administrations, in addition to the Board of Education.

In addition to the City agencies involved in direct operation of programs or in supervision of operating agencies, there are at least four other City agencies and innumerable divisions, bureaus and units that play some part in approving or funding early childhood programs.

The chaos created by this multiplicity of responsibilities is compounded by the funding patterns. Funding for facilities and operating expenses comes from a variety of City, State and Federal sources. Guidelines are unclear. In some instances, notably in licensing procedures, requirements are restrictive and not only create obstacles to funding but to the delivery of service.

And this funding process is only one of the confusing variables faced by parents and community groups. Eligibility for service varies from program to program because of historical happenstance rather than rational decision. Some programs are free and, in others, parents pay fees. The degree of parent and

PS 004762

community participation varies over a wide scale. Educational content is only included in one family day ca e program that is funded by the Department of Social Services.

No data, research or overall planning helps to guide communities in the location or type of program to be initiated. And there is virtually no communication between programs either on a Citywide or local level.

The rigid staffing qualifications set by the New York City Health Code virtually lock out a large group of talented non-professionals whose vital role in teaching young children has been abundantly demonstrated.

Efforts to construct, rehabilitate or lease new facilities have been frustrating. The numbers of approvals required from different agencies, the lack of funds to enable community groups to take the first necessary steps in the process or obtain funds to finance renovation of facilities, effectively bar almost all but wealthy groups from sponsoring centers. These sometimes unrealistic demands have meant unconscionable delays and even more unconscionable continuing gaps in service.

Lack of coordination--lack of communication--lack of planning--all these have helped to perpetuate

lack of service. There is unanimity on one point above all others, and that is that our society is guilty of the tragic, overwhelming and continuing neglect of tens- or hundreds-of-thousands of children in New York City during the most critical years of their lives.

Need is always difficult to measure, particularly since waiting lists tend to be self-limiting. Parents cannot register children in areas where there are no programs, and they do not register when lists are so long that the prospect of admission is completely discouraging.

It is probable that *all* children need some kind of program of educational stimulation in their pre-school years. Experts have confirmed the fact that the developmental phase from birth to six is not merely crucial, but that it determines to an overwhelming extent the entire future pattern of life. Society has been slow in recognizing the importance of this fact. But it is recognized now. Minority groups, the poor, the working mothers and citizens in general, are demanding that recognition be followed by action. Parents are no longer content to see their children begin to fall behind in the first year of school nor will they continue to accept illiteracy as a way of life.

Incredible as it may seem, it is a fact that in

New York City only 57,000 children under the age of six out of a total of 825,000-or only seven percent of all p -school children--are in any recognized early childhood program.* And even though waiting lists reflect only a small part of the need, it is important to note that there are 8,000 children on the waiting lists of day care centers operated under the supervision of the Department of Social Services. There are no waiting list figures available from the central Head Start office, but many Head Start centers record waiting lists as large as the number of enrollees in the center.

There are countless numbers of children in families below or close to the poverty line. Many live in decaying neighborhoods and, more often than not, in crowded, dilapidated housing. Medical statistics record anemia levels that indicate that there are a substantial number of children in these areas who suffer from nutritional deficiencies. Today, we know that such deficiencies may have a serious effect on how well children function.

The presence of so many young school age children on the streets, and the evidence of narcotic addiction at an early age make it reasonable to assume that a great many school age children are in need of supervision

---

*these figures do not include children enrolled in kindergarten.

in their out-of-school hours.

Urban life and the shortage of housing for more than one family under the same roof make it unlikely that relatives will be available to care for children when the mother is not present.

There are simply not enough early childhood programs in the City. But we do have something to build on and, in that sense, we are rich. There *is* diversity. It exists not because of a plan but, because at various times, civic groups, parents or government agencies became aware of need and attempted to meet it in a particular way. In these recurring attempts there was frequent disregard for existing programs or patterns, so that programs developed separately and unrelated to other programs. Some needs, such as infant care, night care, and short term or "drop-in" care, were never met at all. But there is the beginning of the wide range of services that we must have in order to meet the wide range of needs.

Historically, the origins of group day care can be traced back to the 1850s. During the depression years of the 1930s, a number of centers opened with money provided by the Works Project Administration in order to provide jobs for teachers. Today's publicly-

funded program grew out of the emergency created by World War II. Although its chief raison d'etre was the employment of women, it incorporated strong concern for children. Other early childhood programs, such as Head Start, came out of the poverty program with its insistence upon strong parent involvement in all aspects of early childhood services.

In addition to the public and philanthropically-supported programs, there are private and proprietary programs in the City. These have been in existence for varying periods--some for thirty or more years. The majority operate part day nursery school programs and charge fees that restrict their use to people in middle or upper income brackets.

The picture, then, is confused. There are gaps in types of services, and there are far too few places for the numbers of children who need care. Lack of communication between programs makes it difficult for a child to move from one program to another as his needs change. Parents have no one place to go in their communities to learn what services are available, or to be helped to select the service best qualified to meet their child's need. Space is available in private agencies and in family day care homes, but lack of

coordination has made it difficult to move children from group day care waiting lists to family day care homes. Licensing requirements have made it impossible to make full use of community workers who may have a very special knowledge and a rich contribution to make to the programs. Jobs that should lead to careers are, too often, dead end roads for family day care provider mothers, and for parent aides and community workers. And expansion is restricted not by lack of funds but by lack of rational procedures for either construction or program.

Through his appointment of a Task Force, the Mayor announced his concern for the young children of this City. In reporting its recommendations, the Task Force expresses its gratitude for this concern and its conviction that this *is* a time for action. The City can give national leadership to the national interest in early childhood development. Such leadership can result in a new approach to the expressed principles and suppressed implementation of the democratic principle of equal opportunity.

The Task Force believes that its major recommendations are dramatic in the sense that they contemplate almost total change in administration and

procedure, while retaining the diversity of programmatic approaches that presently exist. The recommendations t at follow this introductory statement are made, in each instance, in response to a specific prob!em. The problem and the reason for the recommendation appear in the body of the report.

One recommendation transcends the others, and on its implementation will depend the growth and shape of early childhood programs--established and innovative--in the future. That recommendation is to bring together as many programs as possible in a new Department of Early Childhood Services. To insure parent and community participation at the policy-making levels, the Task Force has recommended the appointment of a Commission as an integral part of the new Department.

The new Department is designed, not to create another layer of government, but to absorb many of the existing and overlapping agencies and procedures. All other recommendations deal with structure and procedures in an effort to bring order and simplicity to this chaotic field.

In presenting its recommendations the Task Force recognizes that, at best, it has proposed one small step toward the ultimate goal of care for any part of the

24-hour day for all children on all income levels in whatever form and for whatever time the parents and the pi gram director agree is desirable.

It remains the firm conviction of all the members who worked to produce this report that the care and education of young children is a top priority for our City and our country, and that all the concern of government must be focused on eliminating the obstacles, solving the problems, building the facilities, training the staff, and providing for parents the rich educational opportunities they want for their children, and ours.

*"There should be some type of organization where all people interested in early childhood development could come together instead of being scattered all over the place . . . what this City needs is an organization whose primary focus is on our primary resource--the children."**

*the above quotation and those that precede all chapters are taken from testimony given at public hearings held by the Task Force.

Chapter II

THE DEPARTMENT OF EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES

The Task Force Recommends the establishment of a Department of Early Childhood Services within the Human Resources Administration with a chief administrative officer of Commissioner or of equivalent status.

The Department shall plan, administer and fund all publicly-funded early childhood programs, except those currently operated by the Board of Education.

Group and family day care programs, now under the auspices of the Department of Social Services, shall be transferred.

The Head Start and Family Day Care-Careers Programs, now under the auspices of the Community Development Agency, shall be transferred.

The Department shall assume responsibility for administering the Department of Parks Pre-School Program.

The Department shall be responsible for licensing all early childhood services, public and non-public.

Major Goals of the Department

To provide a variety of early childhood programs.

To insure that an educational component is included in all programs.

To insure that existing early childhood programs are enriched and expanded.

To provide for communication, information-sharing and planning among all programs.

To enable children to move from one program to another as the needs of the family or child change.

To give children from different backgrounds and with various handicaps an opportunity to participate in the same center.

To provide for strong parent involvement in all early childhood centers.

To encourage and enable parent, community and church and industry-related organizations to sponsor early childhood services.

To increase knowledge and understanding of the developmental years of childhood.

To work toward the day when no child in New York City will be denied access to the advantages of an enriching early childhood experience.

Functions of the Department

A. Funding

The Department's prime responsibility shall be to administer and fund all publicly-financed early childhood programs, including DOSS Group and Family

Day Care, CDA Head Start and Family Day Care-Careers, and Parks Department Pre-School. It shall monitor, review, and evaluate programs including those services provided through purchase of service. The Department shall *not* assume fiscal responsibility for pre-kindergarten programs presently operated by the Board of Education.

Top priority shall be given to developing an implementation plan by which the Department assumes responsibility for allocating those Federal, State, and City funds now administered by the Department of Social Services, the Community Development Agency and the Department of Parks. This plan shall provide for the transfer of staff currently involved in administering early childhood services in the Department of Social Services and the Community Development Agency.* The plan shall also provide for the decentralization of staff to expedite the flow of services to the neighborhoods.

Special Consideration: Relationship to Board of Education

Ideally, the Task Force would like the Department

---

*Department of Parks staff will not be transferred since they operate programs directly.

of Early Childhood Services to assume responsibility for funding *all* early childhood programs, including those of the Board of Education. However, we must take note of the fact that federal legislation mandates that the administration of funds appropriated through the Elementary & Secondary Education Act (ESEA) be restricted to the local educational institution; in this instance, the Board of Education; further, that the community school boards established by the State legislature in 1969, were clearly delegated the responsibility of administering pre-kindergarten services within the school system. The direction that the community boards will take with regard to this responsibility is yet to be determined.

> Therefore, the Task Force recommends that the Department of Early Childhood Services initiate and maintain liaison with the community school boards and help them in every way possible to plan for early childhood services.

> It is further recommended that agreements be developed with the Board of Education so that its standards for early childhood programs follow those that may be set by the Department of Early Childhood Services with regard to provision of services and parent and community involvement.

B. Licensing

The Task Force recommends that responsibility for licensing early childhood services, currently performed by the Department of Health, shall be transferred to the Department of Early Childhood Services.

Until such time as the necessary legislative changes can be made to accomplish this, Department of Health staff empowered to make decisions, shall be assigned to the Department through administrative agreement.

Rationale

The administration of early childhood programs cuts across agency lines. For instance, DOSS *funds* sponsoring agencies for group day care but they are *licensed* by the Department of Health. Head Start is funded by CDA, but licensed by the Department of Health. This functional separation began twenty-five years ago and was based on the belief, probably true at that time, that the Health Department offered the only protection for children being taken care of outside their homes. This arrangement is a part of the State law.

It is interesting to note, however, that because their activities are so similar, DOSS and the Health

Department staff agree to accept the findings of DOSS in determining an application for service.

In Family Day Care, the Department of Health exercises no review over DOSS-funded homes, which are certified strictly as a delegated State Department of Social Services function. The Board of Education must meet Health Department standards but its services are not actually licensed. The Department of Parks operates its program virtually isolated from any standard-setting authority.

The CDA Family Day Care-Careers Program offers a graphic illustration of what happens when jurisdiction is divided among agencies. CDA administers the program which is operated through twenty delegate agencies. DOSS certifies the homes, pays stipends to provider mothers and picks up part of the administrative costs. This year, Model Cities assumed the administrative costs for six family day care delegate agencies in their areas. The Board of Education, the Manpower and Career Development Agency and the Human Resources Administration each contribute staff time, consultation service or technical assistance to the program.

Much of this confusion results from the fact that the original source of funds from OEO was terminated in

1968. DOSS took over part of the funding responsibility for Family Day Care-Careers in 1969. The administrative responsibility for the program has remained in the hands of CDA. Such instability in funding and confusion about jurisdiction has created uncertainty about the future of the program though its success has been well-documented.

C. Operation of Programs

> The Task Force recommends that the allocation of funds to sponsoring agencies shall be based upon the number of children served, rather than on the funding source. Allocating funds on this basis will permit children to remain in the same center as the family's income changes, if the parents so choose.
>
> If a sponsoring agency develops a comprehensive program proposal that requires funding from several sources, the Department shall develop a mechanism by which the proposal can be submitted through the proper channels and, further, the Department shall coordinate the funding process which the various components of the proposals may entail.
>
> Every sponsor agency shall develop its own program budget and submit it to the Department of Early Childhood Services for funding. Departmental guidelines shall include provisions for budget modifications and discretionary funds. Every sponsor

agency shall also develop plans for ongoing evaluation of its program.

The Task Force specifically recommends that the three publicly-funded early childhood programs--CDA Family Day Care-Careers, DOSS-operated and DOSS-purchase of service Family Day Care--and proprietary family day care now under the Department of Health, be administered through one unit in the Department of Early Childhood Services. This unit shall provide a variety of services, including educational, consultative, vocational counseling and in-service training, similar to the CDA model. Provider homes, now licensed by DOSS-operated Family Day Care, shall be contracted out to community and voluntary agencies presently sponsoring neighborhood group or family day care.

The Task Force also recommends that separate units be established for Group Care, with divisionsfor Infant Care, Services to Three to Six-Year Olds, Head Start, Liaison to the Board of Education, and non-publicly funded programs that will be licensed by the Department.

The Department will not operate programs. However, it shall have the authority to sponsor demonstration and pilot projects. If, after evaluation, these projects prove worthwhile, they shall be taken over by community sponsors.

Programs in Temporary Facilities

The Task Force recommends that the Department shall approve and provide funds to community groups sponsoring early childhood services serving fewer

children than the number allowed by DOSS, and to operate programs in temporary facilities while these groups plan for permanent facilities. This provision should be implemented immediately with specific guidelines established. Funds shall be available to help them meet minimum licensing and funding standards. In order to receive these funds, groups must be serving families who meet current DOSS standards with regard to eligibility requirements. Lack of State incorporation as an agency providing day care services shall not be used as a reason for denying these funds.

D. Research and Long Range Planning

The Department shall be responsible for research, evaluation and long range planning, including the physical planning and development of facilities. It shall coordinate its planning activities with those of other agencies.

Rationale

One central agency must be responsible for collecting the demographic and other data which document present and future need for early childhood services. Such information should be available to the public.

In developing plans for a wide range of services for children, it is clear that the Department will need information from other city and private agencies that provide such services as health care, recreation, transportation, etc.

E. Physical Planning and Development

The Department shall be responsible for the planning and development of facilities, including provisions for financing their construction and renovation. Specific recommendations are discussed in Chapter VI of this report.

F. Establishing Staffing Standards

The Department shall develop and implement training and career development programs. It shall also make provisions for center staff to utilize these career development opportunities as specified in Chapter V

The Department shall initiate the development of new curricula and training methods for use by institutions of higher learning in training early childhood educators and related professionals.

Rationale

A child learns from everyone he comes in contact with: his parents, professionals and non-professionals. Early childhood programs must, therefore, encourage flexible staffing patterns which support the vital role that each group plays in the education of young children. Opportunities must be developed, moreover, for those who wish to develop special skills in working with children.

G. Information and Referral Service

The Department shall provide information and referral services to all early childhood programs, both public and private. Where possible, these services shall be decentralized so that parents and community organizations have easy access to information about the whole range of early childhood services.

H. Technical Assistance

The Department shall provide technical assistance for the development of facilities and programs. Technical assistance staff shall be available in neighborhood offices to expedite the approval process for potential sponsors of new programs and, also, to assist them in setting up health, education, and organizational components.

I. Advocacy

The Department shall provide staff to work with groups to press for changes in City, State, and Federal laws as well as in administrative arrangements, when those affected believe that such changes are needed.

J. Public Affairs

The Department shall establish a public affairs unit to handle media relations and to write and produce informational material.

Fiscal Responsibility of Sponsoring Agency

A. Three Percent Contribution

> The Task Force strongly recommends that this requirement be discontinued immediately regardless of the agency's ability to pay.

Rationale

At present, agencies sponsoring group day care funded by DOSS must contribute three percent of the operating costs. The rationale for this three percent contribution originated 25 years ago when City officials believed that if a voluntary agency contributed toward the program costs, it would become more involved in the center. In many instances, it did, because board members had to spend time raising money. However, emerging community organizations in poverty areas find such thinking obsolete. They cannot sponsor group day care because they cannot raise the necessary funds. Furthermore, this policy has eroded over the years. Some voluntary agencies now contribute little more than one percent annually by agreement with the Department of Social Services. If the contribution is discontinued, funds raised by a sponsor agency on its own could be used to enrich the center's program over and beyond items covered by public funds.

B. State Incorporation

The Task Force recommends that the Department of Early Childhood Services begin negotiation with the State Department of Social Services to amend the law that mandates special incorporation for agencies sponsoring day care centers.

Rationale

Current regulations mandate that agencies sponsoring day care services funded by DOSS be incorporated for such purpose. This requirement grew out of the era when voluntary agencies had to solicit funds and was intended to protect private philanthropic efforts. The Task Force has found that the process for incorporation is long and cumbersome and, again, prohibits new community organizations from sponsoring services in their neighborhoods.

Because part of the requirements involve assessment of individual board member's ability to assume financial responsibility for the center, as well as his moral and social standing in the community, people living in poverty areas are unduly scrutinized by the State Department of Social Services. Many community people find such an approach insulting and condescending. The Task Force is aware of groups who

had to wait for from nine months to one year before being formally approved by the State. Furthermore, of the 36 day care centers now under construction or renovation by the Department of Social Services, only one-third have been incorporated. So DOSS is faced with the possibility of having the centers ready for operation but with few agencies incorporated to sponsor the services.

Inasmuch as we are moving toward 100 percent public funding of day care centers, the need for special incorporation of agencies to insure fiscal accountability is obsolete. Such responsibility can be insured through contractual agreements such as now exist between public and delegate agencies that sponsor Head Start and CDA Family Day Care Programs.

Special Considerations

Most important and immediate is the matter of adequate funds. For, without money, it is clear that the goals set forth for the Department cannot be accomplished. Regardless of the action that may be taken on the State or Federal level, there are specific steps the City can take at this time to insure, if not expand, the present level of services.

Therefore, the Task Force recommends that:

a. The City of New York continue the current dollar allocation for early childhood services within the City's 1970-71 Executive Budget. This must be done whether or not the Federal Government increases its level of reimbursement for early childhood services. The Mayor, Board of Estimate and the City Council should insure that City money that may become available is not reallocated for other purposes.

b. Any City tax-levy funds should be immediately available to cover the anticipated deficits in CDA Head Start and Family Day Care-Career Programs.

c. The City and State should use additional funds that may accrue to provide early childhood services for those children who may not be eligible for care through federally-reimbursable programs.

". . . It has taken us more than half way through the 20th century to concern ourselves with early childhood education and to realize how important the beginning years are. . . . My great-grandfather was a builder. I remember him telling me he always put the best material into the foundation because that was the thing everything else was going to stand on. So I think early childhood education is the most important part of education."

Chapter III

A LOOK AT THE PROGRAMS

Enrollment vs. Need

As was stated in the introduction, less than seven percent of the children under six years of age living in New York City are served by early childhood programs, not including the kindergarten programs of the Board of Education. The City Planning Commission estimates, based upon its analysis of vital statistics with live birth data projected from 1965 to date, that there are about 825,000 children under six years of age living in New York City. Of that number, about 57,000 are served in programs shown in the following chart:

PROGRAMS	NO. OF CHILDREN SERVED[1]
Privately-funded	25,000[2]
Board of Education Pre-Kindergarten	8,000

---

[1]All enrollment figures cited by central office of operating or administering agency as of March 1, 1970. The enrollment figures do not necessarily represent numbers of children served due to their entering and leaving programs and to overlap.

[2]Department of Health estimate.

Board of Education More Effective Schools	2,500
Board of Education Early Childhood Centers	285
D .S Group Day Care	8,000
DOSS Family Day Care	1,500
CDA Family Day Care-Careers	3,000
Head Start	5,800
Parks Department Pre-School	3,000

As shown on the chart, publicly-funded programs account for about 32,000 children; privately-funded ones, about 25,000.

There is no way to estimate the exact number of children served in unlicensed arrangements, either in individual homes or in centers set up by community groups. We do know that this number is large and that it continues to grow.

The whole question of the universe of need is, of course, one that must be examined. How many people want or need programs? What kind? Where?

From time to time, agencies such as the Bureau of the Budget, the City Planning Commission, the Department of Social Services, Model Cities, try to evaluate the situation. But how can they do systematic planning without an up-to-date count on how many children there

are, where they live, how old they are, the income level of the family, the need for care, what kind of ca[illegible], and other accurate demographic data? Obviously, it is impossible. It can only be hoped that the 1970 census data will supply some of the missing information.

Who Gets What Service There Is

Available studies indicate that the closer a child is to school age, the more likely he is to be served.[3] The Board of Education and Head Start programs are almost exclusively for four-year olds, reflecting these programs' emphasis on school readiness. The under-three group gets the least service. The lack of service for this age group is attributable, in part, to the fact that, until 1968, Health Code guidelines specifically prohibited group day care for children under three. Because of the pressing need for this kind of care, the Health Code was amended and the Department of Social Services now funds two centers for infants, with eighteen more in the planning stage. A good, if belated beginning, but one that doesn't even begin to meet the needs of this age group.

---

[3]Based on Bureau of the Budget and City Planning Commission unpublished reports.

Another group, almost completely overlooked and brought to the attention of the Task Force through its co. ultation with parents and community groups, are those children of school age whose home situation makes after-school services a vital necessity.

It is a matter of particular concern to the Task Force to insure that publicly-funded programs for pre-school children provide service for the mentally or physically handicapped. This is an area which the Task Force feels has not received the attention it should.

How Children Get Into Programs

Another area of confusion was found in the eligibility requirements for the different programs. Because there are so few places in early childhood programs and so many children who want them, this becomes a crucial factor. Eligibility requirements are based mainly on guidelines mandated by the different funding sources (See Appendix A). None of these consider the specific needs of children for early childhood services, but rather serve to select children on the basis of the social and economic needs of their families.

In addition, the operating or administering agency often adds its own restricting guidelines. For instance,

the Board of Education gives priority to welfare recipients and to children whose siblings receive free lunches.

Only the Parks Department Pre-School Program accepts children on a first-come, first-served basis. All other programs are almost exclusively for poverty and near-poverty families, though the definition of what constitutes poverty or near-poverty varies from one program to another. The notable exception to this poverty orientation is the new Early Childhood Centers program of the Board of Education, financed by City tax levy funds. It enrolls children of women returning to teach in poverty area schools up to fifty per cent of total enrollment.[4]

The Department of Social Services will accept children from higher income families in both group and family day care when there is an urgent social need for services, demonstrated to the satisfaction of the admitting caseworker. Fees are charged according to a sliding scale based on ability to pay. Of all public programs, only those funded by DOSS charge fees.

---

[4]At this time, less than 10 percent of the children enrolled in these centers are teachers' children.

The CDA Family Day Care-Career Program is tied into a work/training component. In order to be eligible, all user mothers must be on public assistance or of low income and be enrolled in a skills training program or a full-day remedial education course or be employed.

Residence in the neighborhood served by the center is a requirement of all programs, but, generally, this is loosely defined. The exception is the Board of Education programs where the child must live in the school district.

Guidelines for Head Start, also adopted by the Board of Education, mandate that every recruitment effort be made so that the center's ethnic composition reflects the neighborhood's. Guidelines for other programs make no mention of selection on the basis of ethnicity.

Board of Education recruitment is handled by family service staff under guidelines established by the school principal. For Head Start, the decision to admit is made by the family service staff, under the supervision of a social worker. In the DOSS Group Day Care Program and the DOSS-operated Family Day Care Program, the admitting decisions are made by a DOSS Bureau of Child Welfare caseworker at the local center.

Obviously, some across-the-board coherence for

eligibility requirements is needed--badly. Taking into consideration the fact that New York State Department of Social Services guidelines establishing eligibility for free group day care services under the 1967 Social Security Amendments, *will* be based upon an income level of $7,500 a year for a family of four,

> The Task Force recommends that this poverty line income level shall be used to determine eligibility for free early childhood services in all programs.
>
> In order to eliminate the individual means test, eligibility for service should be based on residence in a target area*. Inasmuch as such a procedure is now precluded by legislation that governs some programs, as an immediate measure, determination of financial and social need and ability to pay shall be by declaration.
>
> No mother receiving public assistance (or otherwise defined as being low income or poverty level) shall be required to be employed or to seek employment as a pre-condition for receiving early childhood services. Where federal legislation mandates such a requirement, federal funds

---

*The term "target area" could be defined by the percentage of families in a given area having incomes below the poverty line, numbers of children under age six, and by other criteria that might be established by the Department in compliance with Federal and State funding mandates.

must be supplemented by City and State funds to pay the cost of care for those children whose mothers do not wish to work.

As a family's income increases, a fee based on a sliding scale or a dual flat fee system** shall be established, and shall be the same across programs.

The staff of individual centers shall be responsible for implementing the Federal, State and City guidelines with respect to eligibility.

Grievance procedures shall be available in the Department for those families who are denied admission arbitrarily.

What the Programs Include

Program content varies according to the goals and philosophy spelled out in program guidelines.

The Group Day Care Program has its roots in World War II when the national emergency made it imperative to provide care for children of working mothers. With the end of the war, the need to respond to this particular situation was over and the program was taken over by the Department of Social Services--known then as the

---

**Two fees: one for those above a certain income level, e.g., $10,000 or above, and one for those below.

Department of Welfare. It has been administered by the Division of Day Care of the Bureau of Child Welfare as one answer to the social and psychological needs of low income families, as well as those of working mothers. There is an educational component in the program but the program rests on a welfare orientation.

DOSS Family Day Care, also under the Bureau of Child Welfare, is provided in home settings rather than in group centers. Supporters of this program believe that some young children do better when they do not have to compete with a large number of children as in the group center. The DOSS-operated and purchased family day care services flow out of this philosophy, which has its roots in foster care.

The CDA Family Day Care-Career Program evolved out of the Head Start Program and was established to provide training and work opportunities for mothers participating in the program either as users or providers of care. There are strong vocational training and educational components in the program to equip the provider mothers to give the children an enriched pre-school experience.

Title I programs, operated by the Board of Education, emphasize the educational component.

Head Start aims for total development of the child and his family--educational, social, psychological and physiological--with emphasis on school readiness and on family and community involvement.

The Parks Department Pre-School Program is primarily recreational but is also intended to broaden the cultural horizons of children by providing story-telling, painting, library activities, arts and crafts, etc.

Program Hours

The only programs that operate a sufficient number of hours each day to accommodate mothers who work during the day are the DOSS Group Day Care and the Family Day Care programs. They are open from eight in the morning to six at night. Even these hours do not completely fill the need for travel time and taking care of household chores.

The Department of Health reports that only about fifteen proprietary and voluntary agencies run full-day programs.

Most other programs operate on a half-day basis. The exceptions are twenty-four Head Start Centers and two More Effective Schools Centers, open from about 9 to 3;

and fourteen Early Childhood Centers, which operate from 8 to 4 to accommodate teachers' children.

There are two main reasons for the preponderance of half-day programs. The first is programmatic; for example, the belief that young children ought not to be in a classroom for longer than three to three and a half hours. The second is practical. Space limitations, for example, may necessitate split sessions.

Evening or night programs for children whose mothers work these shifts, and drop-in service to give mothers time for shopping, clinic visits or other chores, are virtually non-existent.

All DOSS programs, Head Start and most proprietary and voluntary agencies, maintain a year-round schedule. The Board of Education and the Parks Department run their programs during the school year.

Head Start's summer program, which last year gave some additional 17,000 pre-schoolers an eight-week educational experience, was cut from the Federal budget for 1970.

Taking into consideration, then, the complete lack of some programs, the gaps in others and the need to expand early childhood services for the total development of the child and his family,

The Task Force recommends that all early childhood programs shall have a strong educational component with health and specialized social services available.

Early childhood services shall be made available, either in regular or special programs, to children with special needs. The Department of Early Childhood Services shall initiate liaison with public and voluntary agencies that work with mentally retarded and physically or emotionally handicapped children, not only to make sure they are not excluded from the Department's concern, but also to use the skills and know-how acquired by people who have worked in this field over the years for the benefit of all early childhood services.

Guidelines for new services such as Emergency, Drop-In, and Night Care, shall be developed and such programs shall be established based on the expressed needs of individual communities.

The Department shall also be responsible for developing after-school programs for school-age children.

The Department shall collaborate with the Department of Health to develop standards for health care of children enrolled in early childhood centers, including training the people who provide such services.

Educational Liaison

In addition to the recommendations relating to the Board of Education that appear in Chapter II, to make sure that every child who has benefited from an enriched educational experience in an early childhood program has an opportunity to build on that experience,

> The Task force recommends that the Department shall develop procedures with the Board of Education, and with private and parochial institutions, so that those benefits are not dissipated by lack of appropriate follow-through.
>
> The Department shall initiate Follow-Through Programs, similar to the Head Start model, to provide an upgraded kindergarten curriculum in all elementary schools.
>
> The Department shall, also, provide information on and encourage the development of scholarships for economically disadvantaged children who may wish to attend private elementary schools.
>
> And, finally, the Task Force recommends that the State Department of Education establish criteria and a certification process so that sponsoring agencies may receive accreditation as educational institutions.

What the Programs Cost

The City Budget for 1969-70 allowed a total of $42,100,000 for early childhood services as seen in the following chart. By comparing these total program costs with number of children served, some estimate can be made about per capita costs in a given program.

NAME OF PROGRAM	CHILDREN SERVED	AGENCY	AMOUNT OF BUDGET*
Group Day Care	8,000	DOSS	$16,500,000
Family Day Care	1,500	DOSS	2,000,000
Family Day Care-Careers	3,000	CDA	4,000,000
Head Start	5,800	CDA	11,100,000
Pre-Kindergarten	10,785	B of E	8,000,000
Pre-School Program	3,000	Parks Dept.	500,000
		TOTAL	$42,100,000

It is difficult to compare each program by unit cost because of differences in hours of operation, length of program year, staff-child ratio, and salary differentials.

The program analysis done by the Bureau of the

*These figures are based upon Bureau of Budget estimates.

Budget in 1968 suggested that monthly unit costs may provide the most accurate comparison. At that time the Bureau found DOSS group day care was the most expensive and the Pre-School Program of the Parks Department the least.*

Pending Federal Legislation: Discussion of Its Impact on New York City Early Childhood Services

There are several pieces of legislation pending in Congress that, if passed, will have major impact on the development of early childhood services in New York City.

One of the more important is the Family Assistance Program (FAP). This is the Administration bill that provides minimum income to families participating in the program. Child care will be provided for mothers to enable them to go to work. Child care is thus linked to jobs. The present form of the legislation recommends that child care service be 100 percent federally reimbursed.

This legislation has evoked major criticism because it appears to push mothers of school-age children into the job market as an alternative to public assistance. Many parents are strongly opposed to this kind of approach

---

*For further information on currently operating early childhood programs, refer to the Fact Sheets in Appendix A.

to social welfare.

Other legislative bills, introduced by Brademas, Dellenback and Ford, provide comprehensive child development services that move beyond the job-link orientation of the FAP plan. Many believe that this legislation, if passed, will provide a real opportunity for mounting broad-based child development programs that can include education, health, nutrition, specialized social services, etc.

"Head Start is a program that shows that community control is feasible . . . It has given my child a sense of belonging, responsibility, concern for classmates, and a sense of wanting to learn. She has brought joy to the family . . ."

Chapter IV

PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The demands of parents and community groups to control the development and administration of early childhood services within their own neighborhoods evolved out of frustrations with large bureaucracies and an increasing distrust of government and its ability to respond to their needs.

The antipoverty legislation of 1964 gave additional impetus to the movement toward community control by calling for local involvement in the planning and delivery of services. This legislation provided the thrust for organizing the disenfranchised and established the Head Start Program, which served as a model for parent involvement in early childhood services.

It is no accident, therefore, that recent pressures to change the antiquated process of providing day care services, as well as the demand for community control, arose from parents and groups who were part of the City's poverty program.

These parent and community groups have led the

struggle for local control of early childhood services. Their approach has moved far beyond the reforms sought by professional and civic organizations over the years.

The Task Force has been impressed by the parent involvement in the Head Start and Family Day Care programs and the degree to which such involvement has been maintained on a citywide level.

The Task Force wholeheartedly endorses the philosophy that mandates parent and community involvement in every aspect of early childhood services.

> The Task Force recommends* the establishment of an Early Childhood Commission as a policy-making body for the Department of Early Childhood Services with the majority of its members being parents of children enrolled in programs funded by the Department.
>
> One-third parent representatives on the boards of existing sponsor agencies. For those agencies that sponsor other services in addition, a special committee for the early childhood program to be set up with a majority of parents.
>
> A majority of parent representatives on the boards of future sponsor agencies.

---

*These recommendations are repeated and enlarged upon in the body of this Section but, because we feel they are particularly significant, we are listing them here.

> Parent-controlled policy advisory committees for every publicly-funded early childhood center.

The Early Childhood Commission

> The Commission shall establish the policies of the Department of Early Childhood Services but shall *not* be responsible for its day-to-day operations. The Commissioner of the Department shall serve as chairman of the Commission.

He shall vote, however, only in cases of a tie. The Commission shall meet at least once a month. A majority of its members shall constitute a quorum for transaction of all business, including the convening of additional meetings if necessary. Members shall be paid on a per diem basis.

The Commission shall employ a secretary to take care of administrative matters such as preparation of agendas, acting as liaison to the Department, etc.

Membership

> The Commission shall consist of no more than twenty-one members; the majority to be parents of children enrolled in programs funded by the Department at the commencement of their term of office.
>
> Parents receiving early childhood services from agencies not funded by the Department shall also be represented on the Commission.

> Commission members shall serve a two-year term and parent representatives shall serve no more than two consecutive terms. At its establishment, one-half of the Commission shall be appointed for one year terms so that no more than one-half of the membership will be retired within a year.

The Mayor shall appoint all members of the Commission. He shall appoint two members from a list of five submitted by each of the following organizations:

City-Wide Head Start Committee

City-Wide Policy Advisory Board of Family Day Care

Council Against Poverty (Poverty Area Representatives)

Day Care Council of New York

Community controlled day care groups

Confederation of Local School Boards

The Task Force recognizes that most community controlled day care groups are not represented by a single organization. They must, however, have meaningful representation on the Commission. To this end, the existing groups should agree to meet for the purpose of selecting nominees to be presented to the Mayor. The Human Resources Administrator shall be responsible for

convening this meeting.

The Mayor shall insure that at least two members from each borough have seats on the Commission except Staten Island, which shall have at least one.

The Mayor shall appoint in addition six members from citywide agencies, including one representative of agencies concerned about children with physical or mental handicaps.

Functions

Approving the Department's annual requests for capital funds and operating expenses before these budgets are presented by the HRA Administrator for review by the City Planning Commission, the Mayor, the Board of Estimate, and the City Council.

Establishing policy for the approval of individual requests for grants.

Serving as an appellate body for parent grievances and for sponsoring agencies seeking or receiving funds from the Department.

Serving in an advocate capacity to the Department and safeguarding the interests of children and their parents.

Developing overall guidelines--within statutory

limitations--for early childhood programs funded by the Department, including standards for personnel policies and qualifications.

Acting on other policy matters as may be deemed necessary.

Having the ability and financial resources to engage consultants from a variety of fields including health, psychiatry, psychology and social services and, particularly, those from educational institutions involved in the training of early childhood educators.

The Commission shall also consult with representatives of Model Cities, the Professional Association of Day Care Directors, and various unions that represent central and center staff.

Board Membership

The Task Force believes that, as a goal, parent involvement should exist at *all* levels of early childhood services--classroom, center and City agencies. Federal Inter-agency Requirements already mandate parent participation for all federally reimbursable programs. These, however, should only serve as *minimum* guidelines. For programs such as Head Start, which has already achieved a great measure of parent involvement, such

involvement should be supported and maintained. Head Start has pioneered in the field of parent-community responsibility and some of its policies should be used as a model for the development of early childhood programs.

Board Membership - Current Programs

> Recognizing the existing variety of agency sponsorships, with varying degrees of parent and community involvement, the Task Force recommends that each agency strive for full parent involvement at the earliest possible time on the policy-making board level, as well as in an advisory capacity.

In order to insure that such parent involvement takes place in the immediate future,

> the Task Force recommends that for agencies whose sole responsibility is the operation of early childhood programs, there be one-third parent representation on the board level.
>
> That, for agencies who operate early childhood programs as well as other services, a special committee be set up with responsibility for the early childhood program. The membership of this committee should be composed of a majority of parents with children currently enrolled in the program.

Board Membership - New Agencies

In considering the extent to which parents should be represented on the board of agencies that will sponsor early childhood services in the future, Task Force members were unable to come to a unanimous decision. This reflected, perhaps, the ideological conflicts that exist regarding *parent vs. community* involvement as compared with *parent and community* involvement. The majority opinion held that, for new agencies, parent representatives should constitute a majority of the board. However, a minority, almost one-half of the Task Force, believed that the boards of sponsoring agencies should consist of a broad spectrum, one-third parent, one-third community, one-third professional and civic interests. This issue will need top priority attention from the Early Childhood Commission.

Policy Advisory Committee

> Besides representation on board level, the Task Force recommends that all agencies receiving public funds for early childhood services have a policy advisory committee and that this committee be elected by the parents or persons who have children currently enrolled in the program.

This committee shall have authority to invite non-voting participants from the community and from

professional ranks and shall be the mechanism through which parent representatives are selected for board membership.

The policy advisory committee shall participate in planning the center's program, including preparation of proposals. It shall make recommendations on staff hiring, set up grievance procedures, and perform activities as outlined in the Federal Inter-Agency Requirements. It shall have its own funds for parent activities.

". . . Most of us feel very strongly about the contribution that paraprofessionals have made in the life of the children. And I think there is no disagreement about the warmth and understanding the children must have. But I also feel that the children are entitled to the skills that come from education. And that the way for the paraprofessionals to get that education must be opened and made more flexible and fluid."

Chapter V

STAFFING QUALIFICATIONS

The New York City Health Code,[1] which has the legal responsibility for setting staffing standards through the New York State Social Service Law, provides a number of options for becoming a qualified group teacher:

a. Licensing by the New York City Board of Education as an Early Childhood teacher and completion of at least 150 hours of practice teaching in Kindergarten or pre-kindergarten; or

b. Certification by the State Education Department as an Early Childhood teacher under regulations in effect prior to September, 1966; or

c. Eligibility for certification by the State Education Department for teaching in Early Childhood grades, plus upper elementary grades, except for the citizenship requirement, upon

---

[1] See Appendix B for Excerpt from the Health Code on Staffing.

completion of 300 hours of practice teaching, 150 of which are in pre-Kindergarten. Also completion of 30 semester hours of education; or

d. Certification by another public or private certifying agency whose standards are equivalent to those specified in paragraph (c); or

e. Having a plan for meeting the requirements in (a), (b) or (c) approved by a college accredited by the University of the State of New York.

In order to obtain either State Certification or City licensing, a person must have a college degree with a specialty in Early Childhood Education.

The New York City Health Code exceeds all Federal, State and local guidelines except those of the Board of Education, which require a teacher to be licensed in Early Childhood by the New York City Board of Education. The latter entails fulfilling essentially the same course credit and practice teaching requirements as State Certification, plus passing both written and oral examinations prepared by the Board of Education's Board of Examiners.

The State Department of Social Services requires

that "heads of groups" (the equivalent of group teacher) be "qualified by appropriate degree or certificate, with good physical and mental health, of good character and shall possess suitable personal qualifications for working with children."

The OEO guidelines for Head Start state that, ideally, a teacher should have a college degree in Early Childhood education, with studies in related fields, and teaching or other relevant experience. They go on to state:

> OEO does not require completion of degrees or certificates as a condition of professional employment. Degrees are one indicator of competence. But degree or not, the record of performance is an even more accurate guide. In some communities, state or local law requires certification. Such law must be complied with. However, grantees should carefully examine the requirement to determine whether it in fact applies to pre-school programs. . . . This does not mean, however, that only certified or formally-trained persons should be considered. Since a male authority figure is missing in many poverty households, a man with limited training may be more desirable than a woman having all the requisite education. Similarly, a non-certified bilingual teacher is obviously preferable to a certified teacher who cannot communicate with the children enrolled in the center.[2]

---

[2]Office of Economic Opportunity, *Head Start Child Development Programs, A Manual of Policy and Instructions*, Washington, D.C., September, 1967, pages 13-16.

In reviewing the City, State and Federal requirements, it is obvious that the City Health Code has the most stringent standards. This has been due to the firmly entrenched conviction on the part of most professional early childhood educators that the education of young children should only be entrusted to academically-trained people.

Parent, professional, and community groups now criticize these educational requirements because they lock out many competent people who lack credentials. Many of these groups also question the relevance of training to the job to be performed. The New York City Department of Health, recognizing this, has been quite lenient in its interpretation of option "e", thus enabling many people who would not otherwise be able to do so to advance to group teacher.

Staffing Patterns for Classrooms

In the group programs, there are generally fifteen children to a class, except for DOSS programs which place four- and five-year olds in groups of twenty.

The Health Code requires[3] at least one teacher

---

[3]Except for the Parks Department program which, by its nature, does not come under Health Code requirements.

and one assistant teacher in each classroom. In addition, the Department of Social Services uses a third person--either another assistant teacher or a teacher aide--in each classroom. The Board of Education uses the basic staffing pattern--one teacher plus one teacher aide or educational assistant--in the regular pre-kindergarten classes. The More Effective Schools use three teachers for every two classes and one teacher aide in every class. The Board of Education Early Childhood Centers have four staff members for each class: two teachers and two teacher aides or educational assistants.[4] Head Start uses one or more head teachers in large centers.

Other Staffing Patterns

The Health Code requires a director for every center who, in addition to being a qualified teacher in Early Childhood, must have a minimum of two years' experience in pre-school programs. Additional staff employed in the center varies according to the nature of the program.

Head Start staffing patterns, for example, call

---

[4]One teacher and one teacher aide work from about 8-2; the others from 10-4, so that there are actually four people in the classroom for only a portion of each day.

for an administrative director, an education director, a social worker, and a part-time psychologist. The Department of Social Services employs an assistant director for its large centers and, in some centers, uses an administrative associate.

Family workers and family assistants are used in CDA Family Day Care-Careers, Board of Education and Head Start programs. The staff and parents from these programs gave eloquent testimony to the value of the family service staff, and many people associated with the DOSS programs expressed a desire for this kind of staff.

There are no specific educational requirements for family day care provider mothers. Each one cares for a maximum of six children, including her own.

Standards for provider mothers are set by the State Department of Social Services.[5] These standards apply to all provider homes that are reimbursed by the State. For other provider homes, including those operated on a proprietary basis, the Health Code requires certification only for those mothers who care for

---

[5]The assessment of these qualifications depends on the professional judgment of the investigating caseworker.

children under two years of age; otherwise certification is voluntary.

In-Service Training

During the course of its many meetings with program representatives, the Task Force heard staff of all kinds--professional, paraprofessional, administrative, clerical, volunteer parents, etc.--express the need for more in-service training. They urged that this training be part of a career ladder program, and carry academic credit to insure mobility both within and outside the program. There was general agreement, too, that there be released time and financial reward for this training.

Two training programs for DOSS group day care staff, developed with the Day Care Council, are now underway. One, developed with New York City Community College, provides for bookkeepers to move up to administrative associates. The credits earned under this program, for which students are granted released time by DOSS, are applicable toward the A.A. degree. The other, developed with Lehman College, allows assistant teachers with partial college training to become certified group teachers with baccalaureate degrees. These students are given released time two afternoons

a week, and will earn twelve credits during the first year.

Salaries

Salaries for group teachers in DOSS and Head Start programs have improved considerably in the last few years but there is still some discrepancy between salaries in these programs and those of the Board of Education. They are as follows:

Head Start	$7,500 - $10,584
DOSS	$7,950 - $11,000
Board of Education	$7,950 - $14,500

It must also be noted that the Board of Education staff have a ten-week summer vacation, which enables them to seek summer employment; and that DOSS staff works more hours per day: from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. or longer.

Head Start has had particular problems in recruiting social workers. The entry-level salary for a Master's in Social Work or equivalent, is $8,500, much less than social workers earn in other institutions. The Board of Education starting salary for social workers is $10,000.

Local 1707 of the Community and Social Agency Employees Union is the bargaining agent for staff

employed in DOSS Group Day Care centers; the United Federation of Teachers is the bargaining agent for all Board of Education staff.

Paraprofessional salaries in all programs are too low. Teacher aides in the DOSS and Head Start programs, for example, start at $5,200 a year.

Family Day Care provider mothers do not receive salaries but are paid stipends of $75 a month a child, plus $15 a month a child for food.

The whole question of stipends is one that should be looked into. The women who receive them are doing a full child care job and, yet, are not even accorded the dignity of receiving a regular salary. Not only is this method of payment demeaning, but it presents very real financial problems. Provider mothers are not able to plan their budgets because their income stops and starts depending on the number of children in their homes; they get no vacations; and there is no real career ladder that permits them to increase their income as their skills increase.

The Task Force believes strongly that education and advancement opportunities must be available to all staff. At the same time, it endorses the value of quality education.

Therefore, the Task Force recommends that new methods be established to include performance as a criteria for teacher qualification and that this be achieved by emphasizing work experience in preparation for teaching positions.

The Task Force further recommends more flexible routes by which those working in early childhood centers may advance to the position of group teacher.

These flexible routes shall include educational programs, as well as in-service training in child care and development, and infant care.

Arrangements shall be made for the care of the children, including "released time" provisions while the center worker is in training.

The use of "floating" teachers as part of the staffing pattern is suggested as a way to expedite staff training.

The Task Force recommends that staffing qualifications, as prescribed by the Health Code, be amended so that persons without formal academic credentials can be employed within competitive salary ranges. Further, Code revisions shall provide opportunity for these persons to advance to positions such as group teacher through a variety of academic and in-service training experiences.

The City shall begin an immediate study of the Health Code to make revisions on staffing qualifications beyond those specified above.

The Task Force recommends that the Department of Early Childhood Services establish a special committee to devise alternate ways for non-college as well as partially-college-trained staff to complete a college education within the City University system.

In addition to cooperating with colleges in developing new educational programs, this committee will work toward the creation of new staffing patterns for early childhood centers.

A leading educator suggested that flexibility in staffing day care centers should include the possibility of hiring as group teachers people who have had prior experience as assistant teacher, plus some special workshops. Each cluster of three group teachers and their assistant teachers should be placed with a thoroughly experienced Early Childhood curriculum specialist or supervisor who would work closely on a daily in-service basis, on program planning and development and interaction and growth of children. These group teachers would be expected to attend college part-time while on the job, with the ultimate goal of obtaining a bachelor's degree with a specialty in Early Childhood education.

If the Family Assistance Plan legislation is passed by Congress, it will require that mothers of school age children be in a training program, seeking employment, or employed, in order to be eligible for family assistance. FAP will provide funds for such training.

> The Task Force recommends that some of these training slots be used to train mothers receiving Family Assistance to become child care workers, thus making maximum use of the child care provisions of the Act and providing employment opportunities.

> The Early Childhood center, as viewed by the Task Force, is a total teaching-learning situation. To this end, all persons in the center, including participating parents, should meet at least once a week for in-service training.

> Each early childhood center shall provide the children with a program of educational enrichment, as well as a complete range of physical and mental health services and social services. These services to be available on the premises through employment of part-time professional staff or, through referral. Funds should be provided for these services through Federal or State reimbursement to Group Day Care Centers presently funded through DOSS. If this is not possible, the City should make funds available.

A family worker shall also be employed by each early childhood center to perform such duties as recruitment, referral, community services, and coordination of parent activities.

". . . I see building after building going up without space for day care centers. And parents keep running around looking for make-do space in storefronts, and in church basements and in abandoned buildings. It costs more money to run around trying to find space and fix it up, than if day care centers were included in new housing. The little children are the only ones who are always in makeshift quarters . . . that's a disgrace in a city like this. I think we should take a stand that no building should go up--certainly no dwelling unit--and absolutely no dwelling unit that is getting public funds--without day care facilities being included."

Chapter VI

EXPANSION OF FACILITIES

Nowhere is there more need for revision or change than in existing procedures for creating new facilities for early childhood programs. The experiences of community groups in attempting to work their way through the Kafkaesque maze of red tape to get an early childhood center licensed and approved almost defies description. But one thing is clear--Government has shown a remarkable inability to respond to change.

The Task Force agrees that children cannot live and cannot be served in hazardous conditions and we in no way support any procedures that state otherwise. However, we do believe that the City should develop policies to expedite the development of safe facilities and, at the same time, allow for urgently-needed, rapid expansion of services.

Moreover, the high cost of land, the scarcity of building space, as well as the dilapidated conditions of existing housing, are creating pressures upon City government to re-examine the procedures and the standards by which facilities are currently approved.

Permanent Facilities

The Task Force recommends that the Department of Early Childhood Services be concerned with the long range development of facilities including capital construction; further, that the City adopt a policy whereby space for early childhood centers is included in the construction of multi-dwelling units, public and privately-built office buildings, where feasible.

In order to insure community participation, the Task Force recommends that parent and community representatives be involved in the initial planning stages for early childhood centers including those which may be publicly or commercially-operated.

Temporary Facilities

The Task Force has recommended in Chapter II that funds be available to community groups for the operation of programs in temporary facilities including funds for minor renovations. A definite time limit should be set for the operation of such temporary facilities.

The Task Force strongly recommends that until such time as the Department of Early Childhood Services is established, the Departments of Health, Social Services, Buildings, and Fire develop procedures whereby the recommendation regarding the availability of funds for temporary facilities is implemented immediately, including revisions of appropriate code sections, if necessary. The Special Office of Day Care, DOSS,

shall be given additional staff to expedite this recommendation.

The Task Force also recommends that the Department study the cost and practicability of purchasing or leasing portable, prefabricated, light steel structures for use as temporary facilities. If the results of the study are favorable, the Department will press for a review of the Building Code to put this plan into operation.

FINANCING OF FACILITIES

New Provisions

The Task Force recommends that the new Department establish a division of finance with responsibility for generating new financing plans for the construction of facilities and to assist community groups in securing such financing.

The division's responsibility shall also include working with private lending institutions to devise new and more flexible financing methods. It shall also work with seed money loan corporations in an effort to obtain private grants.

Community groups need help to finance the construction of new facilities. Data obtained from the Department of Social Services indicate that, as of May 31, 1970, 41 sites have been approved by the Board of Estimate and are awaiting construction or renovation. But nothing has happened, mainly because

either thelandlords or the community group is having difficulty in obtaining a loan to finance the construction. Because of the current tight money market, many groups have found that private institutions are reluctant to extend loans to communities and organizationsthat have little or no collateral. This situation presents a special hardship to churches, especially those in low income areas, which are excluded from using the State Youth Facilities Mortgage Program.

The Task Force recognizes that seed money from the private sector will, most likely, be insufficient to help community groups develop new facilities. The Department of Social Services estimates that at least $500,000 in seed money is needed for this purpose, just to take care of present needs.

> The Task Force recommends that the City immediately establish a Seed Money Fund so that community groups planning permanent facilities can have funds for architectural and legal services, organizational staff and program planning.

The Task Force is aware of the fact that such an approach is being considered by Model Cities and the Human Resources Administration and supports expansion of this approach.

Revisions in Existing Financing Methods

1. City Direct Lease Program

In 1968, DOSS instituted its Direct Lease Program under which landlords are encouraged to renovate and adjust their buildings for day care use by sponsoring agencies. Necessary bank loans or mortgages are secured by 15- or 20-year leases with the City, at the end of which time the renovated space belongs to them, free and clear. The Direct Lease Program has many advantages for landlords. Among others, it permits them to arrange for renovation or construction outside of public bidding.

Major criticism has been raised by community groups about the lack of community participation in planning of these landlord-initiated sites. According to DOSS, of 242 sites in the process of approval, 67 have no community group attached to them. Because DOSS policy now calls for non-public sponsorship of services, it will be necessary to identify and attach a sponsoring agency to these facilities before they open.

In order to make the Direct Lease Program more responsive to the community needs, the Task Force recommends that:

> No lease be signed with a landlord unless a community group is attached or has been involved with the planning of the facility.

Landlords be prohibited from obtaining a Direct Lease after a potential sponsor has obtained a private commitment to purchase the landlord's property through a Youth Facilities Mortgage.

Contractual agreements under the present lease program be reviewed immediately by the Corporation Counsel and Department of Real Estate, specifically in the areas of fire insurance, maintenance, and landlord-tenant-city relationships. These obligations must be clarified to expedite loans to sponsoring agencies from private lending institutions. The Department of Early Childhood Services will collaborate with the Corporation Counsel and the Department of Real Estate in developing a lease agreement that serves this purpose.

The Task Force further recommends that these revised agreements provide for continued use of early childhood facilities after the initial fifteen or twenty year lease; further, that lease renewals provide options for purchase.

2. *State Youth Facilities Mortgage Program*

The New York State legislature passed the Youth Facilities Improvement Act in 1969 to help non-profit community organizations obtain a mortgage to purchase land, or a building capable of being renovated for day care use. In 1970, this fund was increased to $100,000,000 and legislation was passed to provide $2,000,000 for seed money grants. Since the inception of this program in September, 1969, only two mortgage

applications have been approved for all of New York State. The Task Force believes that the procedures for using this fund are extraordinarily cumbersome. As a matter of fact, most community groups do not have enough money to develop the necessary data to even apply for a State mortgage loan. The Department of Social Services reports that, of 59 sites being considered for Youth Facilities Mortgages, fifty are still awaiting DOSS approval because the community groups have not been able to present the preliminary plans needed by the Department before it can issue a Letter of Intent and refer the group to the State Department of Social Services. When and if such Letter of Intent is issued, the State must review the referral and perform a lengthy feasibility study before it decides to issue a "formal invitation" to the community group to apply for a mortgage loan.

The Task Force recommends several ways to open up this funding source:

> The State Department of Social Services, through administrative agreement, should permit the Department of Early Childhood Services to perform the feasibility study, including a title search, which meets the expressed needs of the State program.
>
> In order to coordinate approvals for the Youth Facilities Mortgage within one office, the State Department of Social Services should agree to assign staff,

including an appraiser or mortgage administrator, to the Department of Early Childhood Services.

3. Other Ways to Obtain Sites

Condemnation Procedures

In view of the fact that a substantial number of community organizations are unable to negotiate leases or purchase property approved by the State and City for day care because the price is higher than that considered reasonable under the State Youth Facilities Mortgage Program, the City should, as a matter of course, use its condemnation powers so that the fair price can be determined by the courts. It is City policy to condemn property for public improvements such as schools. Early childhood centers are equally important.

The Task Force recommends that legal approvals, such as the City Planning Commission's and the Board of Estimate's be obtained in order to use this procedure.

Purchase of City-Owned Property

The Task Force recommends that the Mayor direct the Commissioner of Real Estate to make certain city-owned property available to early childhood sponsors for the Youth Facilities Mortgages. Further, that these properties be made available at costs comparable to those

accorded to the Board of Education or the Housing Authority.

Licensing and Permits

There are numerous steps to facility approval and almost as many governmental agencies to deal with.* The figures tell the story. Since 1968, when the Department of Social Services decided to expand day care services quickly by using the Direct Lease Program, only six centers have been opened by this route. As of May 31, 1970, there were a total of 360 day care sites in the process of development--242 through the City Direct Lease plan, 59 through the Indirect Lease plan** and 59 pursuing Youth Facilities Mortgages. Of these 360 sites, only 36 are in the renovation or construction stage.

Of the 242 sites in the hopper under the City Direct Lease Program, preliminary drawings have not yet been completed for 165 sites. These drawings must be submitted before DOSS, the Department of Real Estate and other appropriate City agencies give their approval. Included in these 165 sites are 50 which are still awaiting review by the borough offices of the City Planning Commission. Several sites have been delayed in these offices for from three to four months.

In the Department of Social Services, alone, a proposed site must be approved by four different

*See Appendix C.
**DOSS signs a contract with sponsor group to pay for operating cost and amortizes renovation costs with the rent, if necessary. In these instances, the sponsor organization owns the building.

units--the Special Office of Day Care, the Division of Day Care, Plant Management, and Management Planning--before being referred to the Borough President's Office, the City Planning Commission--and its borough offices - and then on to the Department of Real Estate, the Bureau of the Budget, the Board of Estimate, the Corporation Counsel, and the Departments of Health, Fire, and Buildings.

One of the major bottlenecks in the approval process is to get community agreement on a site. For example, the City Planning Commission Central Office reviews sites to find out if other public improvements are planned for the area. At the same time, the Commission's borough office investigates "community reaction" toward the proposed site. It then notifies the local Community Planning Board which has responsiblity for advising the Borough President's Office on matters which affect the area. Some Community Planning Boards also investigate community feelings about the proposed site and they may use a different constituency than that used by DOSS. After review, the Community Planning Board registers its approval or disapproval of both the site and the sponsoring agency. It then makes decisions known to both the Borough President's Office and the borough office of the City Planning Commission.

There have been several instances where the CPC borough office vetoed a site after initial approval by DOSS because it felt that community interest had not been considered. In another instance, a CPC borough office recommended a bowling alley rather than a day care center for a particular site.

The Task Force has recommended previously that the licensing function of the Department of Health be transferred to the Department of Early Childhood Services.

The Task Force further recommends that the Department coordinate the approval process. To implement this recommendation, staff empowered to make decisions shall be assigned to the Department of Early Childhood Services from the Departments of Buildings, Fire and Real Estate by administrative agreement.

The Department shall also make an immediate study of the present Health Code and develop recommendations for changes beyond the specific ones recommended elsewhere in this document.

Inasmuch as all proposed facilities must be reviewed by various community planning bodies, depending upon funding source, the Task Force recommends that necessary approvals be a part of the Department's initial site evaluation.

The Task Force also recommends that staff from the Corporation Counsel be assigned to the Department to perform the title search so that once a

decision has been made by the Board of Estimate there will be no further delays in moving into the renovation and construction phase.

Inevitably, there will be a number of city agencies involved in the approval process for facilities; therefore, the Task Force strongly recommends that the Department of Early Childhood Service provide technical assistance, on a decentralized basis, to expedite the approval process both within the Department and among the other City agencies.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Fact Sheet 1

PRE-KINDERGARTEN

Agency Auspices

Board of Education:
Operating

Description of Program

Provides three hour programs, either morning or afternoon, in a classroom setting during the school year. Emphasis is on school readiness.

1969-70 Enrollment (as of 3/10/70)

8,600

Number of Schools

170

Children on Waiting List

Approximately 2,000*

1969-70 Budget

$7,500,000

Funding Source

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Cost per Child

$905
(Does not include allocation of administrative, supervisory or space costs)

Ages Served

Four years

Eligibility Requirements

The schools must be in an economically and educationally deprived area as defined by Title I; the child must reside in the school district. At least ninety percent of the children must be from families considered to fall below the poverty line as defined by receiving public assistance or free lunch.**

In addition, the recruitment process should encourage enrollment of children of all races, creeds, colors and national origins.

Intake

Recruitment is done by the family assistants, under the supervision of the school principal, among families known to the school to be in need of services. No means test is administered.

Fees

None

Children per Class

15

Typical Staffing Pattern

Teacher
One per class
Teacher Aide or Educational Assistant
One per class
Family worker
One per class
Family Assistant
One per school
Administrative, medical, psychological and social worker staff
Share regular school personnel

Salaries

Teacher
$7,950 - $14,500
Educational Assistant
$2.25 - $2.50/hour

Appendix A
Fact Sheet 1

Salaries (continued)

Teacher Aide
$1.75/hour

Note: Educational Assistant and Teacher Aide salaries are now under negotiation and will probably be increased.

Social Worker (MSW)
$10,124-$16,589

Inter-agency Linkages

Department of Health
Standards - setting and provision of medical personnel

Parent and Community Participation

Citywide Policy Advisory Committee

---

*Waiting list figures are not a true indicator of need; first because they are kept only at schools that have a pre-K program, and, second, because potential clients often know how long a list is, so they may not bother to apply.

**According to the Board of Education, a free lunch is given to any child whose parents declare in a letter to the teacher that their income is too low to provide lunch money.

APPENDIX A

Fact Sheet 2

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

PRE-KINDERGARTEN

Agency Auspices

Board of Education:
Operating

Description of Program

Provides three hour programs, either morning or afternoon (except for two schools which are open from 9 to 3). The classes are in schools, located in disadvantaged areas, that have been identified as More Effective Schools under the program which began in 1964 as a result of UFT contract negotiations, intended mainly to provide smaller classes and additional staff. Classes are open only during the school year.

1969-70 Enrollment (as of 3/1/70)

2,500

Children on Waiting List

Not available

Number of Schools

21

1969-70 Budget

Not available

Funding Sources

City Tax levy funds and Title I of the Education and Secondary Education Act

Cost per Child

$1,919
(Does not include allocation of administrative, supervisory or space costs)

Ages Served

Four years

Eligibility Requirements

Same as pre-Kindergarten

Intake

Same as pre-Kindergarten

Fees

None

Children per Class

15

Typical Staffing Pattern

Teacher
Three teachers for every two classes
Teacher Aide
One per class
Family Worker
One per class
Family Assistant
One per school
Administrative, medical, psychological and social worker staff
Share regular school personnel

Salaries

Teacher
$7,950 - $14,500
Educational Assistant
$2.25 - $2.50/hour
Teacher Aide
$1.75/hour

Note: Educational Assistant and Teacher Aide salaries are now under negotiation and will probably be increased.

Inter-agency Linkages

Department of Health
Standards-setting and provision of medical personnel

Appendix A
Fact Sheet 2

Parent and Community Participation

Citywide Policy Advisory Committee

APPENDIX A

Fact Sheet 3

EARLY CHILDHOOD CENTERS

Agency Auspices

Board of Education:
Operating

Description of Program

This program, part of the 1969 UFT contract agreement, is designed to provide care and education to children of teachers returning to teach in poverty area schools and to children of residents in the community. The Centers are open 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. during the school year. At present, all the Centers are located in a school building or annex. Future sites will not be limited to school buildings; they may be located in storefronts, community centers, etc., which will have to meet the requirements of New York City Health Code.

1969-70 Enrollment (as of 3/1/70)

285

Children on Waiting List

Not available

Number of Centers

14

1969-70 Budget

$500,000

Funding Source

City tax levy funds

Cost per Child

$2,632
(Does not include allocation of administrative, supervisory or space costs)

Ages Served

3 - 4 years

Eligibility Requirements

At least 50 percent must be from families whose income falls below the poverty line as defined by receiving public assistance or free lunch. Up to 50 percent can be children of mothers returning to teach in schools in poverty areas. (At present these children constitute less than 10 percent of current enrollment.)

Intake

Same as Pre-Kindergarten

Fees

None

Children per Class

15

Typical Staffing Pattern

Teacher
Two per class - 1 from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m.,
1 from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.
Teacher Aide or Educational Assistant
Two per class - 1 from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m.,
1 from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.
Family Worker of Family Assistant
One per class
Administrative, medical, psychological and social worker staff
Share regular school personnel

Salaries

Teacher
$7,950 - $14,500
Educational Assistant
$2.25 - 2.50/hour
Teacher Aide
$1.75/hour

Note: Educational Assistant and Teacher Aide salaries are now under negotiation and will probably be increased.

Inter-agency Linkages

Department of Health
Standards-setting and provision of medical personnel

Parent and Community Participation

Citywide Policy Advisory Committee

APPENDIX A

Fact Sheet 4

GROUP DAY CARE - DOSS

Agency Auspices

Department of Social Services, Human Resources Administration:
Administering, funding, setting of guidelines, monitoring programs

Independent Sponsoring Agencies:
Operating

Description of Program

Provides care, in a group setting, to children whose parents are unable to care for them because of a need to work, illness, etc. Centers are open from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., but not all children stay the entire day. School-age children, for example, come to the center after school during the school year and all day on vacations and holidays. Some centers also provide drop-in services (see footnote 1).

1969-70 Enrollment (as of 3/1/70)

8,000
(Approximately 900 of these are in after-school programs)

Children on Waiting List

8,000*

Number of Centers

119

Number of Sponsoring Agencies

87

1969-70 Budget

$16,500,000
(Does not include fees or agency contribution)

Funding Sources

50 percent State under Title IV of the Social Security Act

50 percent City tax levy

Note: When the State plan is approved, the 1967 Social Security Amendments will provide 75 percent Federal reimbursement, with the City and State splitting the difference.

Cost per Child

1969-70
$2,250 average
1970-71
$2,600 average

(Does not include allocation of administrative costs or caseworker salaries. Does include fees and agency contribution.)

Ages Served

Majority from 3 - 6 years. Some after-school programs for 6 - 8 years. Two infant care programs. (See fact sheet 4A on infant care).

Eligibility Requirements

The decision to admit is made by a BCW caseworker outstationed at the center and is based on the family's financial and social need. The latter might include such things as the need of the mother to work, absence or illness of one or both parents, unsuitable home environment, etc.

Intake

Caseworker performs diagnostic study based on the above criteria and makes admissions decisions.

Fees

Sliding scale from 0 to $25 per week based on family's ability to pay, as determined by the caseworker on the basis of a formula prepared by DOSS.

Children per Class

15 3-year olds

20 4-year olds

20 5-year olds

6 years and over - about 20, but never more than 25

Typical Staffing Pattern

Director
One per center
*Assistant Director
One, for large centers only
Caseworker
One per center, outstationed by the Bureau of Child Welfare
Teacher
One per class
Assistant Teacher
One per class
Teacher Aide
One per class
Educational Consultant
One a consultant basis from DOSS. Provides some educational consulting, and is also concerned with monitoring programs and providing assistance on fiscal matters.

Salaries

Director
$9,900 - $13,950
Assistant Director
$9,400 - $12,800
Teacher
$7,950 - $11,000
Assistant Teacher
$6,000 - $7,150
Teacher Aide
$5,200 - $5,325

---

*Note: Some centers have an Administrative Associate instead of an Assistant Director.

Inter-agency Linkages

Department of Health
Licensing and provision of medical services

Parent and Community Participation

There is no mandated program of parent participation, though some centers have parent associations. A number of new agencies have parent or community controlled boards. The Day Care Council that comprises representatives of sponsoring agency boards and center directors, has a policy-making role with the Department of Social Services. It also has a Parent Advisory Council.

---

*Waiting list figures are not a true indicator of need; first, because they are kept at local centers so if there is no neighborhood center there is no waiting list; and, second, the size of the list is often known to potential clients, so they may not bother to apply.

Footnote 1 - Drop-in Day Care

There are four drop-in centers on the Lower East Side under the "umbrella" of the United Day Care Centers of the Lower East Side. These centers are being funded on a temporary basis by the Department of Social Services until such time as they move into permanent, licensed, facilities, when they will provide a full range of day care services, including drop-in.

The agencies are as follows:

Action for Progress
15 children

Neighborhood Council to Combat Poverty
15 children

United Organization of Suffolk Street
10 children

Puertoriqueños Unidos
20 children

Footnote 1 - Drop-in Day Care (continued)

In addition, Mobilization for Youth has a small drop-in service as part of its overall early childhood program.

APPENDIX A

Fact Sheet #A

GROUP INFANT DAY CARE

Agency Auspices

Department of Social Services, Human Resources Administration:
Funding

Mobilization for Youth Group Day Care and Riverside Infant Day Care Center:
Operating

Description of Program

Provides care, in a group setting for infants, between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Until 1968, such care was prohibited by the New York City Health Code.

1969-70 Enrollment

Approximately 35

Waiting List

Not available

Number of Centers

2

Number of Sponsoring Agencies

2

1969-70 Budget

Included in overall DOSS group day care budget

Funding Sources

Same as DOSS group day care

Cost per Child

Approximately $4,000 per child, based on Riverside's experience.

Ages Served

2 months to 2 - 3 years

Eligibility Requirements

Based primarily on DOSS criteria; however, the Riverside program was first set up to serve teenage mothers enrolled in the Adolescent Maternity Program.* In the last six months, these requirements have been changed to include working mothers from the surrounding community.

Intake

By social workers employed by Adolescent Maternity Program and BCW caseworkers

Fees

None

Children per Group

Up to 10 children, ages 6 months and older

Up to 8 children, under 6 months

Staffing

Overall director for each program.

One person-in-charge, and one assistant for each group.

Aides, volunteers and other part-time personnel as necessary to assist full-time regular staff.

Consultants may be hired, with the approval of the Department of Health, in such fields as Early Childhood Education, Nursing, Pediatrics, Nutrition, Child Psychiatry, Psychology and Social Work.

---

*This program is funded by the New York City Department of Health Maternity Infant Care - Family Planning Project.

Salaries

Director
$9,900 - $13,950
Child Care Worker
$6,000 - $6,400
Aide
$5,600

Inter-agency Linkages

Department of Health
Licensed both centers; however, the following inter-agency linkages are available only to the Riverside Program :

Adolescent Maternity Program
Specialized social services

Roosevelt Hospital Children and Youth Project
Pediatric services

Parent and Community Participation

Health Code guidelines call for "involvement of the parents at all levels, including policy-making, in order to help them see day care as an extension of the care they give the child at home."

APPENDIX A

Fact Sheet 5

HEAD START

Agency Auspices

Community Development Agency, Human Resources Administration
Administering and operating through delegate agencies

Description of Program

Head Start aims for total development of the child and his family -- educational, social, psychological -- with emphasis on school readiness and on family and community involvement. Twenty-four centers have a full-day program from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m.; the rest have 3 to 3-1/2 hour sessions morning and afternoon. They operate twelve months a year.

1969-70 Enrollment (as of 3/1/70)

5,800

Children on Waiting List

These figures are not kept centrally, nor is the Head Start central office able to make any estimate of the size of the waiting list.

Number of Centers

119

Number of Delegate Agencies

66

1969-70 Budget

$11,100,000

Funding Source

Office of Economic Opportunity, under Title II-A of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended through 1968.

Cost per Child

$1,900 maximum; i.e., full-day, full year

(Includes allocation of administrative costs)

Ages Served

3 - 5 years, but priority given to 4-year olds

Eligibility Requirements

At least 90 percent of the children must be from families whose income falls below the poverty line (defined as $4,000 for a family of 4 plus $500 for each additional) and/or are receiving public assistance. Every recruitment effort must be made to achieve enrollment that reflects the racial or ethnic composition of the families in the area served.

Intake

Done by family service staff and parent volunteers, based on above guidelines, under the supervision of the Social Worker. No proof of income is required.

Fees

None

Children per Class

15

Typical Staffing Pattern

Administrative Director
One per center
Education Director
One per center
Social Worker
One per center (fulltime only in centers 120 and over)
Psychologist
Part-time (roughly one day for every 60-90 children)
Head Teacher
One or more in large centers where classrooms are not in close enough proximity to allow for their supervision by one of the Administrative personnel

Typical Staffing Pattern (continued)

Teacher
One per class
Teacher Aide
One per class
Family Worker
One for every 30 children
Family Assistant
One for centers with 60 children or less, one additional for every additional 60 children

Salaries

Administrative Director
$9,500 - $11,484
Education Director
$9,000 - $10,879
Head Teacher
$8,500 - $10,583
Teacher
$7,500 - $10,584
Teacher Aide
$5,200 - $5,512
Social Worker (MSW or equivalent)
$8,500 - $10,896

Inter-agency Linkages

Department of Health:
Licensing

Parent and Community Participation

There is a Parent Advisory Committee at the classroom, center, and delegate agency levels. Although the guidelines only mandate 50 percent parent representation, in actual practice the composition of these committees is usually 100 percent parents. Each committee elects representatives to serve at the next highest level.

The City-Wide Head Start Committee consists of one parent representative from each of the twenty-six poverty areas, who in turn choose nine representatives from private and public agencies from a list supplied by the Council Against Poverty. In addition, there are six to eight non-voting delegate agency staff members on the City-Wide Committee.

Parent and Community Participation (continued)

All of these committees make policy decisions, help develop and approve budgets, and participate in hiring decisions.

Parents serve as volunteers in the program. They also have a variety of educational, recreational and cultural activities which are financed by special parent activities funds.

The Council Against Poverty must approve all sponsoring agencies.

APPENDIX A

Fact Sheet 6

PRE-SCHOOL PROGRAM

Agency Auspices

Parks, Recreation and Cultural Affairs Administration:
Operating

Department of Parks:
Facilities

Department of Recreation:
Staff

Description of Program

This program is primarily recreational in nature, but is also intended to broaden the cultural horizons of children by providing storytelling, painting, library activities, arts and crafts, as well as opportunities for free play and games. Most facilities are open from 10 a.m. - 12 noon; about 15 have an afternoon session from 1 - 3:30 p.m. They operate three to five days a week, nine months per year (September to June).

1969-70 Enrollment (as of 3/1/70)

3,000

Children on Waiting List

980*

Number of Facilities

98

1969-70 Budget

$500,000

Funding Source

City tax levy funds

Cost per Child

Approximately $166, based on current enrollment and BOB estimate of total budget

Ages Served

4 years and up (younger when space is available)

Eligibility Requirements

None

Intake

Admission is on a first-come, first-served basis

Fees

None

Typical Staffing Pattern

One Recreation Director per facility plus a volunteer parent who serves as an aide

Salary

Recreation Director
$7,500 - $9,200

Note: Collective bargaining is now underway. The new range will probably be from $8,300 to $10,000.

Inter-agency Linkages

None

Parent and Community Participation

Parents serve as volunteer aides in the program.

---

*Waiting list figures are kept only at facilities where there is a pre-school program.

In addition to this program, there are a number of other, informal programs for young children. Adequate information about these programs was not available.

APPENDIX A

Fact Sheet 7

GROUP DAY CARE - PROPRIETARY

Agency Auspices

Department of Health
Licensing
Proprietary agencies:
Funding, administering and operating

Description of Program

Care is provided, in a group setting, by private agencies licensed by the Department of Health. Program content varies widely from one center to another. Most centers operate part-day programs and are open eleven or twelve months; some operate only during the school year.

1969-70 Enrollment (as of 3/1/70)

25,000 total for proprietary and voluntary. Breakdown is not available.

Children on Waiting List

Not available

Number of Centers

92

Number of Sponsoring Agencies

92

1969-70 Budget

Not known

Funding Sources

Private

Cost per Child

Not known

Ages Served

Set by individual agency or center; most serve 3 - 6 year olds.

Eligibility Requirements

Set by individual agency or center

Intake

Performed by center staff. Records kept as required by the Department of Health.

Fees

Vary widely

Average is about $115 per month per child.

Children per Class

Health Code Requirements
10 2-year olds
15 3-year olds
20 4-year olds
25 5-year olds
6 years and over - not applicable

Staffing Patterns

Health Code Requirements
Education Director
One per center
Teacher
One per class
Assistant Director
One per class

Salaries

Vary widely, and difficult to compare because of differences in working hours, fringe benefits, etc.

Inter-agency Linkages

Not applicable

Parent and Community Participation

There is no formal parent participation structure. The actual extent of parent involvement is not known.

APPENDIX A

Fact Sheet 8

GROUP DAY CARE - VOLUNTARY

Agency Auspices

Department of Health:
Licensing

Voluntary Agencies:
Funding, administering and operating

Description of Program

Care is provided, in a group setting, by voluntary agencies licensed by the Department of Health. Program content varies widely from one center to another. Most centers operate part-day programs; about fifteen have full-day programs. Most centers are open eleven or twelve months; some operate only during the school year.

1969-70 Enrollment (as of 3/1/70)

25,000 total for proprietary and voluntary. Breakdown is not available.

Children on Waiting List

Not available

Number of Centers

416*

Number of Sponsoring Agencies

Approximately 400

1969-70 Budget

Not known

Funding Sources

Private

Cost per Child

Not known

Ages Served

Set by individual agency or center; most serve 3 - 6 year olds

Eligibility Requirements

Set by individual agency or center

Intake

Performed by center staff. Records kept as required by the Department of Health.

Fees

Vary widely

Most voluntary agencies have a sliding scale based on ability to pay.

Children per Class

Health Code Requirements
10 2-year olds
15 3-year olds
20 4-year olds
25 5-year olds
6 years and over - not applicable

Staffing Patterns

Health Code Requirements
Education Director
One per center
Teacher
One per class
Assistant Director
One per class

Salaries

Vary widely, and difficult to compare because of differences in working hours, fringe benefits, etc.

Inter-agency Linkages

Not applicable

Parent and Community Participation

Except for parent cooperatives, there is no formal parent participation structure. The actual extent of parent involvement is not known.

---

*Of this total, the approximate breakdown as to auspices is as follows

Group care programs under religious auspices	27%
Social, community, philanthropic	18%
Pre-school programs in parochial schools	27%
Parent cooperatives	13%
Non-sectarian, non-profit elementary schools	9%
Under college and hospital auspices	6%
TOTAL	100%

APPENDIX A

Fact Sheet 9

FAMILY DAY CARE - CAREERS

Agency Auspices

Community Development Agency of the Human Resources Administration through delegate agencies:
Administering and operating

Department of Social Services:
Funding (on a purchase-of-service arrangement)

Description of Program

Provides care in a home setting. The program evolved out of Head Start and was established to provide training and work opportunities for mothers participating in the program. There are strong in-service training and educational components in the program to equip the provider mothers to give children under their care an enriched pre-school experience. Care is provided between the hours of 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. twelve months a year.

1969-70 Enrollment (as of 3/1/70)

3,000

Children on Waiting List

Approximately 500

Number of Homes

839* Active

Number of Sponsoring Agencies

20

1969-70 Budget

$4,000,000

---

*Note: As of March, 1970, there were about 100 additional licensed but, for various reasons, not in use.

Funding Sources

50 percent State under Title IV of the Social Security Act, 50 percent City tax levy. In addition, Model Cities contributes some of the cost of the programs in the Model Cities areas.

Cost per Child

Approximately $1,300

Ages Served

2 months - 12 years

Eligibility Requirements

User mother must be receiving public assistance or low income (currently defined at $6,200 for a family of four). She must also be enrolled in a full day remedial education course or a skill training program, or be employed. On a citywide basis, at least 25 percent of the user mothers must be welfare recipients.

Intake

BCW caseworker, outstationed by DOSS, makes admissions decisions and certifies homes and provider mothers.

Fees

None

Children per Home

Each home is certified to serve up to a maximum of six children, including the children of the provider mother. The average number of user children per home, based on current enrollment, is 3.5.

Typical Staffing Pattern

Director
One per center
Day Care Counselor
One per center
Day Care Aide
One for every 80 children

Typical Staffing Pattern (continued)

Educational Aide
One for every 20 children
Provider Mother
One per home
Applications Counselor
One assigned by DOSS to each center
Vocational Counselor
Provided by the Manpower and Career Development Agency
Education Consultants
Six total, provided by the Board of Education

Salaries

Director
$10,000 - $11,900
Day Care Counselor
$7,500 - $9,000
Day Care Aide
$5,200 - $6,760
Educational Aide
$3,952 - $5,200

Note: These salary figures do not represent a fixed range, but rather reflect current practice. The sponsoring agency fixes its own salaries.

Provider Mother

Stipend of $75 per month per child, plus $15 per month per child for food. This is calculated on a daily basis. Full time care is considered four hours or more per day. The provider mother is not reimbursed for her own children.

Inter-agency Linkages

Department of Social Services
Supplies an Applications Counselor to each Center to certify homes and provider mothers and make admissions decisions.

Manpower and Career Development Agency
Provides training and vocational counseling to career mothers.

Board of Education
Provides educational consultants to assist in training provider mothers.

Parent and Community Participation

Each sponsoring agency must be approved by the New York City Council Against Poverty. There is a City-Wide Policy Advisory Board consisting of 35 percent provider mothers, 35 percent user mothers and 30 percent representatives of professional, civic and social welfare organizations. There are also policy advisory committees at the center and sponsoring agency levels consisting of the same representation. These committees elect representatives to sit on the citywide committee.

There is a parent activities fund that provides for educational, recreational and cultural activities.

APPENDIX A

Fact Sheet 10

FAMILY DAY CARE - DOSS

Agency Auspices

Department of Social Services, Human Resources Administration:
Funding and operating

Description of Program

Provides care to children in a home setting. Service is provided from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., twelve months a year.

1969-70 Enrollment (as of 3/1/70)

1,000

Children on Waiting List

There are some vacancies

Number of Homes

Approximately 260 active*

Sponsoring Agencies

None

1969-70 Budget

$2,047,500

Funding Sources

50 percent State under Social Security Act Title IV,
50 percent City tax levy

---

*Note: As of March, 1970, the DOSS and voluntary family day care programs combined had over additional 100 homes certified but, for various reasons, not in use.

Cost per Child

Approximately $1100

(Does not include allocation of administrative costs)

Ages Served

2 - 12 years, but may include children of the provider mother up to 16 years.

Eligibility Requirements

The decision to admit is based on the family's social and financial need.

Intake

BCW caseworker, based on DOSS guidelines, makes admissions decisions and certifies homes and provider mothers.

Fees

Sliding scale from 0 to $75 per month per child

Children per Home

Each home is certified to serve up to a maximum of six children, including the children of the provider mother. The average number of user children per home, based on current enrollment, is 3.8.

Typical Staffing Pattern

One provider mother for each home

Salaries

The provider mother is paid a stipend of $75 per month per child, plus $15 per month per child for food. The provider mother is not reimbursed for her own children.

Inter-agency Linkages

None

Parent and Community Participation

No formal structure of parent and community participation.

APPENDIX A

Fact Sheet 11

FAMILY DAY CARE - VOLUNTARY

Agency Auspices

Department of Social Services, Human Resources Administration:
Funding (through a purchase-of-service arrangement)

Voluntary child care agencies:
Operating

Description of Program

Provides care to children in a home setting, under the auspices of voluntary agencies from whom DOSS purchases care. Most homes provide service from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. twelve months a year.

1969-70 Enrollment (as of 3/1/70)

500

Children on Waiting List

There are some vacancies

Number of Homes

Approximately 130 active*

Sponsoring Agencies

8

1969-70 Budget

$225,000 (Includes only DOSS reimbursement)

Funding Sources

50 percent State under the Social Security Act Title IV.
50 percent City tax levy

---

*Note: As of March, 1970, the DOSS and Voluntary family day care programs combined had over 100 additional homes certified but, for various reasons, not in use.

Cost per Child

Approximately $1,500

(Includes only DOSS reinbursement)

Ages Served

2 - 12 years, but may include children of the provider mother up to 16 years

Eligibility Requirements

The DOSS decision to reimburse is based on the famiiy's social and financial need.

Intake

Certifying of homes and making of admissions decisions is performed by agency staff. Case record is sent to DOSS who decides eligibility for reimbursement.

Fees

Sliding scale from 0 to $75 per month per child

Number of Children per Home

Each home is certified to serve up to a maximum of six children, including the children of the provider mother. The average number of user children per home, based on current enrollment, is 3.8.

Typical Staffing Pattern

One provider mother for each home.

Salaries

The provider mother is paid a stipend of $75 per month per child, plus $15 per month per child for food. The provider mother is not reimbursed for her own children.

Inter-agency Linkages

None

Parent and Community Participation

No formal structure of parent and community participation

APPENDIX A

Fact Sheet 12

FAMILY DAY CARE - PROPRIETARY

Agency Auspices

Department of Health:
Certifying

Description of Program

Provides an opportunity for individual women to become certified to provide day care services in their homes. This certification is voluntary unless she wishes to care for children under two years, in which case it is compulsory.

1969-70 Enrollment (as of 3/1/70)

Actual enrollment is not known, but homes currently certified are authorized to care for a maximum of 120 children.

Number of Homes Certified

27

Ages Served

Through 15 years. No minimum age is set by Board of Health.

Eligibility Requirements

Set by individual mother

Intake

Certification of the home and the provider mother by the Department of Health. Individual mother makes admission decision, and notifies Department of Health when child is admitted or discharged.

Fees

Vary greatly. Average about $15 per week per child.

Children per Home

Each home can be certified up to a maximum of five children, including the applicant's own children. There may be no more than two children under two years of age.

Staffing Pattern

Provider mother
One per home

The Department of Health employs one Public Health Consultant to answer inquiries, issue certificates of approval, monitor homes, etc.

Salaries

Provider mothers receive their income from fees charged

Inter-agency Linkages

None

Parent and Community Participation

None

Note: It is estimated that the bulk of children in New York City are served in uncertified family day care arrangements. They come under no public scrutiny.

APPENDIX A

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Publicly funded programs

Central office of administering or operating agency

Non-publicly funded programs

New York City Department of Health

Budget figures

New York City Bureau of the Budget

APPENDIX B

STAFFING REQUIREMENTS

EXCERPTS FROM NEW YORK CITY HEALTH CODE

Group Day Care

47.09 Staff

(a) An educational director shall be in charge of the program of a day care service. In addition to being a qualified teacher in early childhood education pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, an educational director shall have a minimum of two years experience as a group teacher in a program for children under six years of age. The educational director shall not have any teaching duties when there are more than 40 children enrolled in the service, or in the case of a day care service which is an integral part of a school with grades one to six or more, having a principal with no teaching duties, when there are more than 60 children enrolled in the service.

(b) 1. No person shall be placed in charge of a group of children unless

a. He is licensed by the City Board of Education as a teacher in early childhood classes and has completed at least 150 clock hours of observation and supervised practice teaching in pre-kindergarten or kindergarten grades; or

b. He has been certified by the State Education Department as a teacher in the field of early childhood education according to regulations in effect prior to September 1966; or

c. He is eligible for certification by the State Education Department for teaching in early childhood grades and upper elementary grades, except for the citizenship requirements if his professional study in education includes:

1. Completion of 300 clock hours of observation and supervised practice teaching, of which at least 150 clock hours shall be in pre-kindergarten or kindergarten grades.

2. Thirty semester hours of study in professional education which includes at least the following:

(a) a one-semester course in the sociological, philosophical, and historical foundations of education, and

(b) two one-semester courses in educational developmental psychology, at least one of which shall be in child development, and

(c) three one-semester courses in instructional methods and materials including instruction in teaching the basic skills, at least one of which shall be on the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten level and

(d) a one-semester course in parent education and community relations; or

d. He has been certified by another public or private certifying agency whose standards are equivalent to those specified in paragraph c of this subdivision; or

e. He has a plan for meeting the requirements specified in paragraph a, b or c of this subdivision within a reasonable time and has obtained approval of this paln by a college accredited by the University of the State of New York. In such case, he shall submit to the Department a letter indicating the time necessary for the completion of the training.

2. In reviewing the qualifications of a person placed or to be placed in charge of a group of children, the Department may accept letters or other appropriate certifications from teacher training schools certifying that such person has met specific course requirements set by this subsection.

(c) A person in charge of a group of handicapped children shall be a qualified teacher in early childhood education pursuant to subsection (b) of this section and shall have additional, appropriate training for work with handicapped children.

(d) A person may be employed temporarily as an educational director or teacher while his certification approval by the State Education Department or other

certifying agency is pending or while his plan for obtaining certification is pending approval.

(e) An assistant teacher shall be a mature person who has at least two years of college education or who is a high school graduate at least 19 years of age.

47.11 Groups

(a) A teacher qualified pursuant to section 47.09(b) shall be in charge of each group of no more than:

(1) Ten children, if the children are two and over and under three years of age; or,

(2) Fifteen children, if the children are three years and over and under four years of age; or,

(3) Twenty children, if the children are four years and over and under five years of age; or,

(4) Twenty five children, if the children are five years and over and under six years of age.

(b) In addition to a teacher qualified pursuant to section 47.09(b), an assistant teacher shall be provided for each group of children when:

(1) The group has more than five children two years and over and under three years of age; or,

(2) The group has more than 10 children three years and over and under four years of age; or,

(3) The group has more than 12 children four years and over and under five years of age; or,

(4) The group has more than 15 children five years and over and under six years of age.

(c) The ratios of teachers and assistant teachers to the number of children in a group of handicapped children shall be determined by the type and severity of the handicaps and shall be subject to the approval of the Department, but the number of teachers and assistants shall not be fewer than the number required by subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

(d) Children in two contiguous age categories specified in subsection (a) of this section may be placed

in one group. When children in different age categories are so intermingled, the requirements for supervision applicable to the age of the majority of the children in the group shall apply.

Family Day Care

53.07 Certificate of approval; application, issuance and conditions

(b) A certificate of approval shall not be issued unless

(1) The applicant and all members of the household are persons of good character, habits and reputation and the home conditions present a satisfactory family environment;

(2) The applicant and all members of the household are in good health and have no disqualifying physical, mental or emotional conditions. These facts shall be evidenced on the original application and, if required by the Department, on renewal applications by written statements signed by a physician and based upon complete medical examinations made within 90 days prior to the date of application. The examinations shall include laboratory tests when indicated and a chest x-ray of each person over 15 years of age taken by the Department or by a private physician. When X-ray films are taken by a private physician, they shall be properly identified and submitted to the Department together with certificates on forms furnished by the Department. When, in the opinion of the Department, an X-ray film is unsatisfactory or discloses a condition which cannot properly be evaluated on a single X-ray, the person to whom the X-ray film relates shall be further X-rayed and, if the Department requires, shall be given further periodic medical and laboratory examinations. After a certificate of approval has been issued, chest X-rays of the holder of the certificate and of all members of the household over 15 years of age shall be taken whenever the Department requires for the protection of public health. The provisions of this subsection relating to chest X-rays taken in connection with an original application shall apply to such further chest X-rays;

(3) The applicant is under 60 years of age at the time of application. An applicant for renewal may be 60 years of age or over if she has held a certificate of approval prior to and continuously since her sixtieth birthday, but she shall submit biennially a written statement signed by a physician that she is in good health and has no disqualifying physical, mental or emotional condition; and,

(4) The applicant is in a reasonably secure financial position, does not work outside the home without the consent of the Department and does not conduct any business in the home or any homework which, in the opinion of the Deparment, may adversely affect the health of the children.

(d) A certificate of approval shall be issued only to a woman. It shall be issued on a Department form and shall state the name and address of the person to whom it is issued, the number and ages of children for whom care is to be provided, and a statement to the effect that the person to whom the certificate is issued maintains an approved home suitable for the care of children.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES

Infant Day Care

3.23 Staff Qualifications

Director: Fully qualified (BA Degree) and experienced in a child-caring profession with very young children: Early Childhood Education, Child Development, Pediatrics, Graduate Pediatric Nursing, Psychology, Social Work or Home Economics.

Teacher (part-time): If the Director is not an Early Childhood Education teacher, a part-time Early Childhood Education teacher must be employed to provide additional developmental and educational experiences for the children. (For qualifications see Article 47 of the Health Code.)

Person In-Charge of Group - Mature, with child-care training; warm, experienced with relevant age level. Previous experience in a recognized child care agency would be helpful.

Assistant: At least 18 years old, warm and interested in young children. Particular consideration should be given to those with some prior training as mother's assistants, provider day care mothers, baby technicians, child care workers, etc.

Notwithstanding staff selection in accordance with the foregoing requirements, all staff working with children must be re-evaluated frequently, as their demonstrated continuing ability to work with children is intrinsic to a favorable mental health climate.

APPENDIX C

STEPS FOR ESTABLISHING A DOSS GROUP DAY CARE CENTER

There are basically four different routes for establishing a DOSS Group Day Care center.

I. Direct Lease/Sponsor Group-Initiated Site

The sponsor group presents a site to DOSS. The landlord has a direct lease with the City in which reimbursement for construction and renovation is included in the rent costs. The sponsor group has a sub-lease with the DOSS Division of Day Care (DDC) for program operating costs.

II. Direct Lease/Landlord-Initiated Site

The landlord presents a site to the City, but eventually the site will be attached to a sponsor group. The final leasing arrangements are identical to those in direct lease/sponsor group-initiated sites but the initial procedural steps vary.

III. Indirect Lease/Always Sponsored

In this procedure, the proposed day care center is usually in a church, settlement house, or public housing project. The sponsor group is responsible for initial planning costs and the cost of renovation or construction, except for centers in housing projects. In these instances, arrangements are made for reimbursement to the Housing Authority for costs. The sponsor group and DDC sign a contract in which DDC pays operating costs and amortizes the cost of renovation with the rent, if necessary.

IV. Loan under the State Youth Facilities Mortgage Program

To be eligible for a Youth Facilities Mortgage loan, the sponsor group must own the site or secure a commitment from the landlord to sell to them. With a loan from the State, the sponsor group can buy the site. A contract is set up between DDC and the sponsor group in which DDC pays for operating costs and mortgage repayments to the State. There is no rent since the sponsor

group owns the site.

The following is a breakdown of the typical process in each of these four routes.*

I. Direct Lease/Sponsor Group-Initiated Site

1. Sponsor group contacts Special Office for Day Care (SODC) for information and initial evaluation of site.

2. A SODC staff member determines the need for day care in the area on the basis of demographic data and the number of public assistance families in the area. If the data indicate a day care need, then he evalutes the site and sponsor group. The site evaluation includes a visit to the site. He then sends a report of his findings to DDC.

3. If the report is positive, at this point, either the landlord or sponsor group can hire an architect. The sponsor group, if it cannot afford one, can use DOSS Plant Management (Pl. Mgt.) architect to develop preliminary plans.

4. At the same time, at the weekly meeting between DDC and SODC, the site and sponsor group are discussed. Tentative decision to proceed is made.

5. Pl. Mgt. visits the site and evalutes its architectural feasibility.

6. If the site has potential, Pl. Mgt. then

   (a) obtains the existing layouts from the Building Department or the landlord, or measures the building if the layouts are not available;

   (b) examines Buildings Department records for history of building;

   (c) prepares preliminary plans, if necessary

   (d) prepares written report.

*This material is based upon an analysis done by the Project Management staff and Task Force consultations with agency representatives from the various City agencies.

7. Meeting with SODC, DDC, Pl. Mgt. and sponsor group to discuss preliminary plans and report, educational program, funding arrangements, tentative budget, responsibilities of sponsor groups. The architect may be present if necessary.

8. DDC sends a Letter of Intent indicating tentative DOSS approval to the sponsor group with a sample operating budget attached. This Letter enables the sponsor group to begin incorporation proceedings with the State Board of Social Welfare.

9. SODC notifies Management Planning (Mgt. Pl) to proceed with negotiations on the site. Mgt. Pl maintains DOSS contacts with other City agencies and with the landlords.

10. Mgt. Pl. requests approval from the City Planning Commission (CPC),* notifies the Councilman, Congressman, Boro President's Office for the area. (The Boro President must later vote on the site at the Board of Estimate hearing.) Also, Mgt. Pl. asks Pl. Mgt., to prepare specifications which together with the preliminary plans will be used in lease negotiations, if the necessary approvals are granted.

11. Approval from CPC consists of several stages.

    (a) CPC Central does initial screening on site and grants tentative approval if no public improvements are planned for the area.

    (b) CPC Central notifies CPC Boro Office to pass on the site. CPC Boro Office investigates the site, talks with local groups, and notifies local Community Planning Board (CPB) which serves in an advisory capacity to the Borough President's Office.

    (c) Local CPB investigates the site and community reaction, and notifies CPC Boro Office of their recommendation for approval or disapproval.

---

*This staff activity is actually carried on by the Department of City Planning.

(d) CPC Boro Office evaluates the local CPB decision and notifies CPC Central of their recommendation.

At the same time that CPC Central notified the CPC Boro Office, it also requested clearance from the Housing and Development Administration (HDA). The HDA Project Manager notifies the HDA Project Director in the field who is supposed to contact local Model Cities. The Project Director reports back his opinion on the site to the HDA Project Manager who is in communication with CPC Central. If either HDA or CPC Boro Office recommend rejection of the site, CPC Central will generally reject it, although it retains power of final decision and can overrule either of them.

12. Mgt. Pl. is notified of CPC Central's approval. Mgt. Pl. notifies Pl. Mgt. to send specifications and preliminary plans to Department of Real Estate (R.E.), Bureau of Licensing and Insurance, and notifies that Bureau to begin negotiations with landlord.

13. Real Estate negotiates with the landlord, arrives at an agreement on rental costs, and draws up resolution for the Board of Estimate.

14. Real Estate requests certificate from the Bureau of the Budget stating that funds to cover the rental costs in the lease are in the City budget. BOB issues certificate.

15. Real Estate submits resolution to its Acquisition and Disposition (A & D) meeting for review.

16. If the resolution is approved at the A & D meeting, it can be submitted to the Board of Estimate hearing.

17. Board of Estimate at its hearing, may approve, disapprove, or lay over site for another hearing.

18. If Board of Estimate approves, then Real Estate draws up certified copy of the resolution and transmits it to Corporation Counsel.

19. Corporation Counsel must approve form of lease, performs lease draft and title search.

20. Lease signed by landlord and Commissioner of Real Estate.

21. Landlord's architect makes construction drawings in consultation with Pl. Mgt.

22. Landlord's architect obtains Bldg. Dept. approval on the construction drawings.

23. Pl. Mgt. rechecks construction drawings and gives landlord's architect permission to request building permit.

24. Landlord's architect obtains building permit from Building Department.

25. Renovation may take from 6 - 8 months. New construction may take from one year to 18 months. Pl. Mgt. monitors the construction or renovation of the site.

26. Plant Mgt. accepts the building on behalf of the DOSS.

27. Inspections by Bldg. Dept. and Fire Department. Fire Department grants clearance. Bldg. Dept. issues Certificate of Occupancy.

28. Sanitarians from the Department of Health make inspection and give approval.

29. DDC assigns an educational consultant to the group.

30. Sponsor group hires a center director who meets the DDC staff qualifications.

31. (a) Center director starts employment when the Building Department issues a certificate of Occupancy.

    (b) At the same time DDC assigns caseworker to begin the intake process.

* *

Approximately 2 - 3 months before the end of construction,

the organization of staff and program begins. This phase goes on concurrently with the inspections process although the step numbers are consecutive.

* *

32. Center director and educational consultant plan the operation of center, develop the final budget.

33. Center director completes staffing and purchasing of furniture and equipment.

34. DDC caseworker completes enrollment of children and arranges for their physical exams.

35. DOSS and Sponsor group sign the contract. (Incorporation from the State must have been granted before contract can be signed.)

36. CENTER OPENS

37. Department of Health, Division of Day Care, Day Camps and Institutions visits the center to license the day care service.

Note: It may take 18 months to two years to complete a renovated site and two to three years to complete one that needs major construction.

II. Direct Lease/Landlord-Initiated Site

The procedural steps listed below are considerably abbreviated when they are identical to the steps in Direct Lease/Sponsor Group-Initiated Sites route.

1. Landlord has a site which he wishes to propose as a day care center. He contacts Real Estate Department.

2. Real Estate refers the landlord with his site to Mgt. Pl., DOSS.

3. Mgt. Pl. does an initial screening of the landlord. If a broker is involved, then Mgt. Pl. determines whether he has the authority to represent the landlord. The site is then re-

ferred to SODC.

4. SODC determines area need for day care and evaluates the sites. He sends report to DDC.

5. Weekly meeting between DDC and SODC. Tentative decision to proceed is made.

6. SODC begins effort to attach a sponsor group to the site.

7. SODC notifies Mgt. Pl. to initiate procedures.

8. Mgt. Pl.

   (a) Requests approval from CPC.

   (b) Notifies Boro President, Congressman, and Councilman about site.

   (c) Notifies landlord to hire architect to draw specifications and preliminary plans for lease negotiations in conjunction with Pl. Mgt. (These are not started until CPC approval has been granted.)

   (d) Advises Real Estate of site status.

   (e) Requests that preliminary plans be sent to Pl. Mgt. for review.

9. CPC approval process is the same as shown for direct lease/sponsor group-initiated sites, and involves CPC Boro Office, local CPB, HDA, and local Model Cities.

10. Mgt. Pl. notifies Pl. Mgt. of CPC approval.

11. Pl. Mgt. can send preliminary plans to Real Estate for negotiating the lease agreement. Full scale plans may not yet be available.

* *

From the point of Real Estate negotiations on through the pipeline, the procedure is the same as that in direct lease/sponsor group-initiated sites. Eventually a sponsor group will be attached to the site. It

will have to become incorporated, helpplan the educational program, and perform other responsibilities as outlined previously.

* *

III. Indirect Lease/Always Sponsored

1. Sponsor group contacts SODC for information and evaluation of site.

2. SODC determines area need for day care, evaluates site and sponsor group. Sends report to DDC.

3. Sponsor group must decide whether to use Pl. Mgt. architect or to hire its own.

4. At the weekly meeting between SODC and DDC, the site and sponsor group are discussed. Tentative decision to proceed is made.

5. Pl. Mgt. or sponsor group's architect visits site and evaluates its architectural feasibility.

6. If the site has potential, Pl. Mgt. or sponsor group's architect:

   (a) Obtains existing layouts from the Building Department or landlord, or measures the building if the layouts are not available;

   (b) Examines Bldg. Dept. records for history of building;

   (c) Prepares preliminary plans;

   (d) Prepares written report.

   (e) Sends copies of plans and report to SODC and DDC. DDC consults on the plans.

7. Meeting with SODC, DDC, and sponsor group to discuss architectural plans and report, educational program, funding arrangements, tentative budget, responsibilities of sponsor groups. The architect may be present if necessary. It is at this meeting that the sponsor group may decide whether it wants to use indirect lease, direct lease, or Youth Facilities Mortgage Loan plan.

8. DDC sends a Letter of Intent indicating tentative DOSS approval to the sponsor group with a sample operating budget attached. This Letter enables the sponsor group to begin incorporation proceedings with the State Board of Social Welfare.

9. Architect must be hired by the sponsor group to do the construction drawings in consultation with DDC and/or Pl. Mgt.

10. Sponsor group secures bids from contractors on the basis of the completed drawings.

11. Sponsor group and DDC fiscal officer come to funding agreement.

12. Sponsor group's architect must obtain building permit.

* *

From this point on the procedure is the same as for direct lease/sponsor group-initiated sites, consisting of three major stages: construction or renovation, facilities inspections and approvals, programming and staffing of center.

* *

IV. Loan from the State Youth Facilities Mortgage Program

1. Sponsor group contacts SODC with a site, and expresses interest in a Youth Facilities Mortgage loan. If sponsor group goes to State Department of Social Services first, it is referred to SODC.

2. SODC establishes need for day care in the area, evaluates site and sponsor group. SODC must determine that sponsor group wants to buy the property, that the landlord is willing to sell to them, and for how much. Site is also cleared through CPC Central to determine if any public improvements are marked for the area.

3. Meeting with SODC, DDC, and sponsor group to discuss site, number of children to be served

and information needed, including preliminary plans before DDC can issue a Letter of Intent.

4. Sponsor group has to hire architect to draw preliminary plans.

5. Once these plans are completed, a meeting is held with SODC, DDC, and the sponsor group to discuss them.

6. If the plans are approved, then DDC draws up a Letter of Intent which indicates that the City will fund the day care center to serve a specified number of children.

7. Sponsor group informs the Area Office, Bureau of Youth Facilities, State Department of Social Service of its interest in a mortgage loan for the purchase of the site, renovation of the existing building or new construction.

8. The Area Office then schedules a feasibility study of the project, including an appraisal of the project.*

9. If the feasiblity study is favorable, the sponsor group is invited to submit an application for a loan. The State Mortgage Administrator will help group fill out the State Housing Finance Agency**application forms. Cost estimates for acquisition, renovation, equipment, and staff are needed for the application.

10. Sponsor group must complete model incorporation certificate. This incorporation procedure is different from the one when a group goes through the City lease process.

11. Construction drawings are done after the application is filled out. State architect reviews them.

12. Sponsor group gets three bids from contractors.

13. Sponsor group's architect must obtain building

---

*Sponsor groups can be stopped at this step if the appraiser from the State finds that the price asked by the landlord exceeds the value of the property, as determined by the State.

**This agency actually makes the mortgage loan.

permit from Building Department.

14. DDC fiscal officer and State Mortgage Administrator set the rate to be paid to the sponsor group, providing funds for operating expenses and mortgage repayments. The State Commissioner signs off on the rate.